



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1995

No. 183

House of Representatives

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-351) on the resolution (H. Res. 275) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING PROVISIONS OF CLAUSE 4(B) OF RULE XI AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-352) on the resolution (H. Res. 276) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—REQUESTING REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT REGARDING ETHICS COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER NEWT GINGRICH

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and pursuant to rule IX, I offer a resolution on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 277

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is currently considering several ethics complaints against Speaker Newt Gingrich;

Whereas the Committee has traditionally handled such cases by appointing an independent, non-partisan, outside counsel—a procedure which has been adopted in every major ethics case since the Committee was established;

Whereas, although complaints against Speaker Gingrich have been under consideration for more than 14 months, the Committee has failed to appoint an outside counsel;

Whereas the Committee has also deviated from other long-standing precedents and rules of procedure; including its failure to adopt a Resolution of Preliminary Inquiry before calling third-party witnesses and receiving sworn testimony;

Whereas these procedural irregularities and the unusual delay in the appointment of an independent, outside counsel—have led to widespread concern that the Committee is making special exceptions for the Speaker of the House;

Whereas the integrity of the House depends on the confidence of the American people in the fairness and impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Therefore be it resolved that;

The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should report to the House, no later than November 28, 1995, concerning:

The status of the Committee's investigation of the complaints against Speaker Gingrich;

The Committee's disposition with regard to the appointment of a non-partisan outside counsel and the scope of the counsel's investigation;

A timetable for Committee action on the complaints.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair holds that the resolution gives rise to a question of the privileges of the House concerning the integrity of its proceedings.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a motion to table will be made. In the event that the mo-

tion to table is passed, this would be an adverse disposition of the privileged resolution.

My inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is, with minor changes of the privileged resolution, would it be in order for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] and myself to file a similar resolution tomorrow and each business day from now to the conclusion of the 104th Congress?

□ 2045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The Chair will note that proper questions of privilege may be renewed.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prohibit members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from discussing ongoing business. Accordingly, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

Mr. ARMEY moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORD VOTE

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 177, answered "present" 10, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 815]

AYES—219

Allard	Barrett (NE)	Bilirakis
Archer	Bartlett	Biley
Armey	Barton	Blute
Bachus	Bass	Boehlert
Baker (CA)	Bateman	Boehner
Ballenger	Bereuter	Bonilla
Barr	Bilbray	Bono

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H13275

Brownback	Greenwood	Petri	Lipinski	Obey	Sisisky
Bryant (TN)	Gunderson	Pombo	Lofgren	Olver	Skaggs
Bunn	Gutknecht	Porter	Lowey	Ortiz	Skelton
Bunning	Hancock	Portman	Luther	Orton	Slaughter
Burr	Hansen	Pryce	Maloney	Owens	Spratt
Burton	Hastert	Quillen	Markley	Pallone	Stenholm
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Quinn	Martinez	Pastor	Stokes
Callahan	Hayworth	Radanovich	Mascara	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Calvert	Hefley	Ramstad	Matsui	Payne (VA)	Stupak
Camp	Heineman	Regula	McCarthy	Peterson (FL)	Tanner
Canady	Hерger	Riggs	McHale	Pickett	Taylor (MS)
Castle	Hilleary	Roberts	McKinney	Pomeroy	Tejeda
Chabot	Hoekstra	Rogers	McNulty	Poshard	Thompson
Chambliss	Hoke	Rohrabacher	Meehan	Rahall	Thornton
Chenoweth	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen	Meek	Rangel	Thurman
Christensen	Hostettler	Roth	Menendez	Reed	Torres
Chrysler	Houghton	Roukema	Mfume	Richardson	Torricelli
Coble	Hunter	Royce	Miller (CA)	Rivers	Towns
Coburn	Hutchinson	Salmon	Minge	Roemer	Vento
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Sanford	Mink	Rose	Visclosky
Combest	Istook	Saxton	Moakley	Roybal-Allard	Ward
Cooley	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough	Mollohan	Rush	Waters
Cox	Jones	Schaefer	Montgomery	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Crane	Kasich	Seastrand	Moran	Sanders	Williams
Crapo	Kelly	Sensenbrenner	Murtha	Schroeder	Wise
Cremeans	Kim	Shadegg	Nadler	Schumer	Woolsey
Cubin	King	Shaw	Neal	Scott	Wyden
Cunningham	Klug	Shays	Oberstar	Serrano	Wynn
Davis	Knollenberg	Shuster			
Deal	Kolbe	Skeen	ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10		
DeLay	LaHood	Smith (NJ)	Borski	Hobson	Sawyer
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Smith (TX)	Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Dickey	LaTourette	Smith (WA)	Goss	Myers	
Doolittle	Laughlin	Solomon	Hayes	Pelosi	
Dornan	Lazio	Souder			
Dreier	Leach	Spence	NOT VOTING—26		
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Stearns	Baker (LA)	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Stockman	Brewster	Largent	Stark
Ehlers	Lightfoot	Stump	Clinger	Livingston	Tucker
Ehrlich	Linder	Talent	Collins (IL)	Manton	Velazquez
Emerson	LoBiondo	Tate	Condit	McCrery	Volkmer
English	Longley	Tauzin	Fattah	McDermott	Waxman
Ensign	Lucas	Taylor (NC)	Fields (LA)	Neumann	Wilson
Everett	Manzullo	Thomas	Gutierrez	Oxley	Yates
Ewing	Martini	Thornberry	Hyde	Peterson (MN)	
Fawell	McCollum	Tiahrt			
Fields (TX)	McDade	Torkildsen			
Flanagan	McHugh	Trafficant			
Foley	McInnis	Upton			
Forbes	McIntosh	Vucanovich			
Fowler	McKeon	Waldholtz			
Fox	Metcalf	Walker			
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Walsh			
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Wamp			
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)			
Frisa	Molinari	Weldon (FL)			
Funderburk	Moorhead	Weldon (PA)			
Gallegly	Morella	Weller			
Ganske	Myrick	White			
Gekas	Nethercutt	Whitfield			
Gilchrest	Ney	Wicker			
Gillmor	Norwood	Wolf			
Gilman	Nussle	Young (AK)			
Goodlatte	Packard	Young (FL)			
Goodling	Parker	Zeliff			
Graham	Paxon	Zimmer			

NOES—177

Abercrombie	Danner	Gordon
Ackerman	de la Garza	Green
Andrews	DeFazio	Hall (OH)
Baesler	DeLauro	Hall (TX)
Baldacci	Dellums	Hamilton
Barcia	Deutsch	Harman
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Dingell	Hefner
Beilenson	Dixon	Hilliard
Bentsen	Doggett	Hinchev
Berman	Dooley	Holden
Bevill	Doyle	Hoyer
Bishop	Durbin	Jackson-Lee
Bonior	Edwards	Jacobs
Boucher	Engel	Jefferson
Browder	Eshoo	Johnson (SD)
Brown (CA)	Evans	Johnson, E.B.
Brown (FL)	Farr	Johnston
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Kanjorski
Bryant (TX)	Filner	Kaptur
Chapman	Flake	Kennedy (MA)
Clay	Foglietta	Kennedy (RI)
Clayton	Ford	Kennelly
Clement	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Clyburn	Frost	Klecza
Coleman	Furse	Klink
Collins (MI)	Gejdenson	LaFalce
Conyers	Gephardt	Lantos
Costello	Geren	Levin
Coyne	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)
Cramer	Gonzalez	Lincoln

Mr. Speaker, the House will not be in session on Sunday, November 19. On Monday, November 20, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour, and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We plan on taking up one bill under suspension of the rules, H.R. 2361, a bill regarding commencement dates of certain temporary Federal judgeships. We will then complete consideration of H.R. 2564, the Lobbyist Disclosure Act of 1995, and act on any appropriation conference reports that are ready. There is also the possibility that a disposition of a veto message will be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, Members should be advised that there will be no recorded votes before 5 p.m. on Monday, November 20, although Members should be prepared to work late in the evening on that Monday.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the majority leader if 5 p.m. is a definite time on Monday? There are those who have asked for 6 p.m. on our side. Is there any possibility of that?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry, and if I may say, on behalf of all the inquiries we have had from so many of the Members, these are very tough times for us and our families. The work must go on, we all accept that, but we must try our best.

We have done our best to accommodate them, but I cannot guarantee that votes will take place at any time other than after 5 p.m.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would again address the question to the majority leader.

We are now, as I said last night, in the longest shutdown of Government by virtue of the inability of the President and the Congress to come to grips with funding the Government in the history of this Nation. We, apparently, are going to have a relatively short day tomorrow. Everybody is going to go home. Eight hundred thousand people across this land are going to worry about whether or not they have a job to go to on Monday, whether they are going to have a paycheck Thanksgiving week, or a couple weeks before Christmas.

I am concerned, Mr. Leader, that we are apparently having a short day tomorrow. We are not going to be here Sunday, and we are not coming back, essentially, apparently to vote, until after 5 p.m. on Monday. That means that we are most assuredly going to have at least another 24 hours on Monday of a Government shutdown.

I am wondering what kind of negotiations are ongoing to try to overcome this impasse between the Congress and the President so that Government can get back to work.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10

Borski	Hobson	Sawyer
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Goss	Myers	
Hayes	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—26

Baker (LA)	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Brewster	Largent	Stark
Clinger	Livingston	Tucker
Collins (IL)	Manton	Velazquez
Tate	McCrery	Volkmer
Fattah	McDermott	Waxman
Fields (LA)	Neumann	Wilson
Gutierrez	Oxley	Yates
Hyde	Peterson (MN)	

□ 2102

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] so that he may announce the schedule.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have concluded legislative business for the evening. We will meet again tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. to consider the conference report for the Balanced Budget Act, if it is necessary after Senate action on the bill; a continuing resolution, which may be considered under suspension of the rules, and any appropriations conference reports that are ready for floor action.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman from Maryland is again quite right in his concern. As the gentleman knows, the President did veto a continuing resolution sent to him by the Congress, thus causing this shutdown. We have passed from this body, and the other body has worked on a second continuing resolution for the President, and the President has said again that he would veto that, thus continuing his shutdown of the Government.

We have spent a good deal of the time today talking with representatives of the White House. We expect to get that continuing resolution to the President for his signature so that perhaps we might be able to resolve the problem by his signing that CR over the weekend. In the meantime, we will continue talking to the White House to see what we can do.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Maryland's concern.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further respond.

There is no question that folks on this side of the aisle are anxious to proceed in Washington, if possible, to complete whatever business is before us in hopes that we can not only return to our communities and to our families for Thanksgiving, but that we could also remove the burden, the pressure on all these Federal workers and those they serve.

Is there any way the gentleman can talk to us about what happens next week, in general? We are anxious, as the majority leader has heard from the gentleman from Maryland, to stay Saturday, Sunday, Monday. Now, what about Tuesday, Wednesday? When, if at all, does the gentleman anticipate people being reunited with their families and their districts?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. We do all we can. We sent a second continuing resolution. We will send the Balanced Budget Act to the President as soon as the Senate is done acting. We will continue to move legislation. The appropriations bills are moving to the White House.

I fully expect that we will have a long evening Monday night. We will undoubtedly work late trying to get as much done as possible and waiting for responses from both the Senate and the White House.

We will work on Tuesday. It is our hope that by Tuesday, 2 p.m., we might be able to see Members get back to their districts or district work relationships and time with their families for Thanksgiving.

But as the President has so sternly said, he is prepared to sit here for 30, 60, 90 days, however, long it takes. We must, therefore, be prepared to do what we can at what time we can to move as much as possible forward, and then snatch those times with our families and our constituents as are available to us in the interim, while work that

we have shipped to the White House is up there for Presidential decision.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would respond further.

We really do have in this House the prerogative of placing before the body a CR that perhaps might satisfy the President. Is there any desire on the part of the majority to introduce another CR, should this one, as the President has indicated, not meet his expectations?

Is there any willingness on the part of the majority to find a way to keep the Government functioning during the Thanksgiving period and beyond?

Mr. ARMEY. The majority is, of course, as the gentleman knows, committed to the historic event of passing a Balanced Budget Act and having it signed into law, and we are working with the White House in every way we know toward that end.

Mr. FAZIO of California. We have already heard that is likely to be vetoed, but that, of course, is still not before the President.

I am hopeful the gentleman will help us find a way to once again offer the President another opportunity, because this body has some of the responsibility as well.

Mr. ARMEY. If I may again remind the gentleman, the second CR, the second effort to pass a second CR to the White House to be signed, will be, if not already, soon be on the President's desk. He will have the opportunity to sign that short-term continuing spending resolution and reopen the various offices of the Government.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair would like to note that he is being as lenient as possible with this 1 minute, but it is probably not the place to debate policy.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACC].

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, if the majority leader would respond, there are a lot of us that are here for the first time, and we are very interested in working every day that people are not working and feel very uncomfortable going back and forth at a time when people are not working.

I have introduced a piece of legislation trying to keep us going on Sunday and not losing that opportunity that we could work and working together to resolve the situation. I was wondering, would the gentleman be opposed if a majority of the Members in your caucus and our caucus were interested in working through the weekend?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California, who controls the time, would yield.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas for a response.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, again I say we have completed our work on the short-term continuing resolution. We have sent and will soon finish tomorrow, after the other body acts, the bal-

anced budget. We are moving to the White House for their careful consideration and signature everything we can as fast as we can.

I believe the Nation is aware of the fact that, given the grueling hours we are working, that it is perfectly reasonable for us, as well as all or most other people in the Nation, to have Sunday with our families.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] for a query to the majority leader.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader's concern to move this legislation expeditiously. Since the Senate has not yet pushed that second CR to the President, if the Senate still has an opportunity to amend that CR before it goes to the President, if they could reach an agreement with the White House on the second CR, which may be different from what the House has passed, can we have assurances from the majority leader that he would forthwith bring up a new CR that came over from the Senate, which may be different from the one we voted on Wednesday night?

Mr. ARMEY. Well, if the gentleman will continue to yield for a response.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for his response.

Mr. ARMEY. A continuing resolution cannot originate in the Senate.

Mr. STUPAK. No, but they can amend it or make changes to the one they received from the House of Representatives before it goes to the White House, and then it would come back to this body for further consideration.

I am asking if the distinguished majority leader would then bring it forth to the floor as soon as possible?

Mr. ARMEY. I believe the Senate passed that 60 to 37 already, so it is not possible.

Mr. STUPAK. That is correct, Mr. Majority Leader, but it has not gone to the White House, so no veto has taken place. Therefore, they can revisit the issue before it goes to the White House; is that not correct?

Mr. ARMEY. The Senate is a mysterious place and it may be possible in that body. I would consider it highly irregular.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield one more time to the gentleman from Maryland for questions about the appropriations bills.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I realize this has gone longer, but we do not have a crisis of this type very often.

The majority leader has indicated we were sending bills down as quickly as we could to the President for consideration to move beyond this present crisis. The Treasury-Postal bill was passed on Wednesday. The legislative bill is also ready to go to the President. I am wondering if we have sent those down or we are expecting to send those down to the White House.

□ 2115

I know we seem to be inconveniencing the gentleman from Ohio. I am really sorry that, the 800,000 people that twist in the wind. But I would like to know whether or not the bills are going to be sent down?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I fear we have tried the patience of some of our colleagues.

The Treasury-Postal bill is, in fact, available for the President and these discussions we have been having with the President, this is one of the topics. Again, we would hope that the President would find a way to agree to sign legislation that could get us by this impasse. We continue talking to the White House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will urge the President to sign both the Treasury-Postal and the legislative bill, if they are sent down there. They have not been sent down there. As I said at the Committee on Rules, I do not blame your side any more than my side, because I think it has been sort of mutually agreed. But my point is, there are 200,000 people affected by those two bills, over 200,000.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's point. I truly do. We will continue working.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order in place of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

BUDGET CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I seek recognition this evening to say that in about 30 minutes there is going to be a very important discussion on this floor. It is going to be a discussion led by and participated in by the freshman Members of the Democratic Party. There are not many of us, but we feel that this is worth taking extra moments to talk about. That is, the need for us to stay here to work out this budget impasse.

We feel that as freshmen we have been elected and sent here to make sure that we move forward the process of government.

We feel that it is clear that with a 2-hour, 3-hour session on Saturday and nothing on Sunday, not until late in the afternoon on Monday, we are making a mistake.

It is not a question of how we spend time with our families or how we worship. We have the opportunity to worship at many fine houses of worship within walking distance of this building. We have the opportunity, those of us in Chamber who worship on Saturday, to worship close by in this building.

But remember, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we have hundreds of thousands of Federal employees across this country who are uncertain. I have spoken to people in my district who work for the Federal Government who are uncertain, people in my district of office who are on furlough, who do not know if they will be able to make their mortgage payment, who do not know if they will be able to pay their rent with the check that is delivered to them for their month's work for November.

Mr. Speaker, I think when we face a problem like this, that we should stay in until we get it done.

I want to spend time with my family, who are home in Louisville this minute, just as much as anyone in this body, just as much. But I think we owe it to the American people to stay at this job to get it done. If it takes staying here until we get tired of looking at each other to the point that we resolved our differences, that is what it will take.

So in about 30 minutes, you will see a discussion on this floor led by the freshman Members of the Democratic Party who will say in no uncertain terms that we stand unified in our commitment to keep this body working throughout the weekend, on through to make sure that we resolve these differences. We owe the people of this country nothing more and nothing less.

BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic debate that we are having about balancing the budget, however I am disappointed by the words from the White House today that there will be no commitment to balance the budget in 7 years and that our attempt to continue funding for the Government will be vetoed even though it received bipartisan support.

That we have come this far in putting forward a plan to balance the budget is a great achievement, but we must not let up. The future of our children and grandchildren is literally at stake in the actions that this Congress and the President take in the interest of bringing fiscal responsibility to Washington.

The citizens of my district and I'm sure many others recognize this and

they have been calling in record numbers to tell us not to back down. These folks recognize that the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 is the single most important piece of legislation that we will work on this session.

They know this because the benefits of getting the Government out of the red are painfully obvious—lower interest rates, greater savings—we have a negative savings rate—and by lessening the burden that we pass along to our future generations. But the President says he won't budge—he says he won't work to balance this budget in 7 years—and he won't accept what the Congressional Budget Office says is a real and viable plan to balance the budget. So what do we do?

We listen to the people back home and we stay here to work to deliver a balanced budget. We don't listen to some phony, half-baked platitudes about the advantages of deficit spending. Not when the calls are coming in from the districts, 9-1 in favor of saving America's future. American's are asking us to do what is right for the country and their children.

They know that the interest in the 5 trillion dollar debt will cost every baby born today over one hundred and eighty thousand dollars and if we continue along this path the country we leave behind won't even be recognizable as the America that we inherited from our parents.

So we've got to start taking some initial, honest steps to bring fiscal sanity to Washington. The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 does just that. With this budget plan we eliminate the budget deficit in 7 years—we do not leave our country with chronic \$200 billion deficits per year, with no end in sight, as the President's out of balance budget does.

We save Medicare from bankruptcy and increase, yes Mr. President increase, what each Medicare beneficiary receives from \$4,800 to \$6,700 while allowing for more choice in the types of health care people receive. But saving Medicare isn't the only benefit we get from balancing the budget.

In fact, all Americans will benefit in the form of lower interest rates—this will save individuals and families hundreds of dollars per month in home mortgage payments and car loans. With lower interest rates this will result in more money being put into our economy to drive production and create over six million new American jobs.

That's right—a balanced budget will create over six-million new jobs here in America.

Mr. Speaker, the future of the country is at a crossroads. We can take the path that Americans historically have when there is a crisis—they look the problem in the eye and tackle it head on. Or we can succumb to the demagoguery, half written budgets and phoney numbers that the White House is peddling and continue to plunge the country deeper into debt.

The American people have spoken to us—they want a balanced budget and

they want it now. For their sake and our children's sake—we should override a Presidential veto of a 7-year balanced budget.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYCE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question. There has been a lot of discussion about the government shutdown. My understanding is that the minute the President agrees to balance the budget in 7 years according to the reasonable numbers of the Congressional Budget Office, a strong bipartisan majority of this body and the Senate will send him a continuing resolution and open up the government. Is that not your understanding?

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, that is correct, as I recall, the vote on this floor was 277 to 151.

Mr. TALENT. All the President has to do is indicate he will agree to a balanced budget in 7 years according to the budget numbers of the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. ROYCE. That is correct.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to address some of the issues that were raised by the previous speaker.

First of all, with regard to the government shutdown and with regard to what some of the freshman Democrats have said, I am very much in favor of their position. I think that we should stay here. We should not be going out of session. We should stay here through Sunday, obviously, in order to see what we can do to work out an agreement so that the Government does not have to continue to be shut down or slowed down as it is right now. I have a lot of Government employees in my district, and I think that is the only right thing for us to do.

The other thing I wanted to mention with regard to the previous speaker is, I do not really think the issue here is a balanced budget because most of the Members in this body on both sides of the aisle feel that we should have a balanced budget. Obviously the President feels that we should have a balanced budget. But what is happening here is that Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership are essentially holding the government hostage to their view or their ideology with regard to a particular type of balanced budget.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, that is not fair, and that is certainly not what has happened here in the past. That is the major difference, if you will, about what is happening in Washington right now as opposed to previous years. In previous years, when there were dis-

agreements about the budget between the two parties or between the President and the Congress, they allowed the Government to continue, they allowed operations to continue, so Americans were not hurt in any way while they argued over their differences about the budget. That should be allowed to occur here now, that is what President Clinton has been saying, that is what most of the Democrats are saying, but that is not what happens because basically Speaker GINGRICH wants to hold the Government shut down, if you will, hostage to his particular ideology about the budget. It is not fair.

I wanted to speak a little bit, if I could, about this, about this budget that was considered today which I was very much opposed to. What I would like to say basically is that the budget that was adopted today and which I did not support, essentially what it does is it takes a huge amount of money from the Medicare Program, from the Medicaid Program, and essentially hurts seniors and those people on low incomes who receive Medicaid right now, and it cuts those programs and really hurts the people that take advantage of those programs in order to provide these hefty tax breaks primarily for the wealthy. If we were to eliminate the tax breaks for the wealthy, we would not have to cut Medicare or Medicaid as much as is being proposed, and at the same time, and even worse, we are asking seniors to even pay more for essentially less health care coverage.

I just like to give some examples of how this plays out in a little more detail, if I could, in the time that I have left. First of all, we have information that shows that the average tax cut for those in the top 1 percent of taxpayers who get a tax cut would be about \$15,000, but for 99.7 percent of all taxpayers in the bottom fifth, they would actually have a tax increase or see no change at all. For those in this group who have a tax increase, their taxes would go up by an average of \$173 a year, so this is only a tax cut for wealthy Americans, it is actually a tax increase for a lot of the taxpayers at the bottommost part who are also working and paying taxes.

With regard to the Medicare Program, because you are taking so much out of the Medicare Program, what essentially happens is that the reimbursement rate to hospitals, to doctors, to health care providers, becomes so much lower in overall terms that it causes them to cut back. Hospitals will close, particularly in my home State, because so many of them are Medicare and Medicaid dependents. A lot of doctors just will not take Medicare any more because of the reimbursement rates, and even more importantly, what they do with the Medicare Program, what the Republican budget does with the Medicare program, is that it changes the emphasis on the dollars towards HMO's and managed care and

against the traditional fee-for-service system where the senior had the opportunity to go and choose their own doctor. It does that in a very insidious way, by saying that the growth that is allowed, if you will, in funding is more in the HMO or managed care side and less on the traditional fee-for-service side where you choose your own doctor, and then, even worse, if you look at this conference agreement on the budget, it says that if they cannot save the \$270 billion in cuts that are proposed in what they propose by moving so many seniors into managed care, then what they do is they have what they call a fail-safe mechanism that basically makes even more cuts again in the traditional fee-for-service system. So what you are going to have is a lot of seniors that cannot find a doctor of their choice.

THAT IS BILL CLINTON SPEAKING, NOT NEWT GINGRICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is very timely for me to speak at this point particularly regarding the issue of Medicare. As a physician I previously took care of many seniors in the Medicare plan. Before I get into some of the comments that have been made today about the Medicare issue, I do want to just stress to all my colleagues that we can get out of here if the President will sign our continuing resolution that simply calls for a 7-year balanced budget with CBO numbers.

Mr. Speaker, the President himself has said that we should balance the budget in 5 years, not 7 years, and the President himself has said that CBO numbers are the more accurate numbers, and to stay here, and stay here, and legislate, and legislate when the problem is at the White House, I think is fully inappropriate, and I really want to talk about this Medicare issue because there has been in my opinion—well, let me just say this. Let me quote from the New York or Washington Post which I think said it very well, what is going on with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle as well as with the President?

The Washington Post said, Bill Clinton and the congressional Democrats were handed an unusual chance this year to deal constructively with the effect of Medicare on the deficit, and they blew it. The Democrats, led by the President, choose instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors. They have shamelessly used the issue, just as we have seen tonight, and demagogued on it because they think that is where the votes are and the way to derail the Republican proposals generally.

Now I would like to go back in time about 2 years, to a day in April 1993 when President Clinton was addressing

a meeting of the AARP, and he said the following. He said today Medicare, Medicaid, and Medicare, are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose, and this is the President and the Democrats in the House saying we propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut, so when you hear all this business about cuts, and we have heard the cut word used just now tonight, let me caution you that this is not what is going on. It is a reduction in the rate of growth.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield; this is what Republicans are saying? Right? Your are quoting a Republican that must have said that.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. No, I am actually quoting the President of the United States.

Mr. HOKE. President Clinton said that these are not cuts.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. That is right.

Mr. HOKE. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. When I came here, I met with the Speaker, I met with the Republican leadership, I met with the chairmen of the Committee on Commerce and the subcommittees, and I felt very strongly that this was extremely important, that we save Medicare. It was announced by the trustees of the Medicare plan, three of whom are Clinton administration Cabinet officials, that the Medicare plan was going to be insolvent, and I felt very strongly that it was extremely important that we maintain the solvency of the program, and the plan, and the proposal that has been put forth, and our budget proposal that we passed today calls for reducing the rate of growth of Medicare to about double the inflation rate. It is going to increase and increase dramatically. Essentially what we are doing is what the Democrats said needed to be done 2 years ago, but now today they are shamelessly, as the Washington Post has admitted, a paper that does not traditionally endorse Republicans, they have said that this is shameless demagoguery.

Let me go on. I will quote President Clinton on a CBS morning show interview March 3, 1994, that is just last year. It is not necessary for us to have a huge tax increase if employers and employees do their part, if we can slow the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid to just two times the inflation, just slow it down where it is only increasing twice as much as regular prices.

My colleagues, that is exactly what the Republicans do in their budget proposal.

Again on October 5, 1993, Clinton said in a White House press conference only in Washington do people believe that no one can get by on twice the rate of inflation. So when you hear all this business about cuts, let me caution you that is not what is going on. That is

Bill Clinton speaking, not NEWT GINGRICH.

WHAT DO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT US TO DO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I believe most Americans are puzzled why we are at an impasse here in Washington, DC. All the bickering about these alleged cuts, and the Speaker in plane rides and the parliamentary procedure is all really distracting us from the main issue, and that is the business at hand, and that is carrying out the will of the people. So let us take a minute just to talk about what the American people would like us to do.

Now I have a chart here that is the marching orders that the people of America have been giving Congress, and this is based on polling data, and all of it runs about 60 to 80 percent. The top one is balance the budget in 7 years, and we will talk more about that later, but basically this is what 80 percent of America wants us to do.

Next is save Medicare from bankruptcy this year, reform welfare, another 80 percent issue, and the third is provide tax relief for families and for job creation. But I want to spend time tonight talking about the balanced budget issue. Let us concentrate on that because that is really what is pending now.

The reason we have 800,000 Government workers off now is because the President is refusing to sign a continuing resolution that has been stripped from all the controversial issues except one, and that is the balanced budget, and the reason I say that is not controversial is because 80 percent of the Americans want a balanced budget. So what the Republicans are proposing is to balance it in 7 years, which is not unreasonable, but the President has already threatened a veto, and now he said many things about the balanced budget. He says he supports a balanced budget. During the campaign he was going to do it in 5 years, and then he said, well, we will do it in 10 years. Then he said, well, 7 may be OK, but it could be 8 or 9. Are you clear on that yet?

Well, I do know one thing, that he did send us a balanced budget, and I can show that to you. This is how it was scored. This is his budget, and you can see from 1996 through 2005 it runs about an average of \$200 billion a year deficit, \$200 billion a year deficit, and, by the way, it did go to the Senate, and it received a "no" vote, or they voted it down 96 to zero. Not one person in the U.S. Senate supported the President's budget. But that is what he has proposed.

This is the problem. The American people want to see a balanced budget.

Now Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, says it is very

important that we balance the budget, and he has a vision of what would happen if we could balance the budget. Let us just look at Mr. Greenspan's vision because he is very knowledgeable about these financial matters. He said our children will have a higher standard of living, that improvement in the purchasing power of incomes would occur, that there would be a rise in productivity, that there would be a reduction of inflation, that strengthening of financial markets, which we have already seen incidentally just from the hope of a balanced budget, the stock market is up nearly to 5,000 points. The bond market is up, all in the hope of balancing the budget for the first time in 26 years, and acceleration of long-term economic growth and significant drop in long-term interest rates.

Well, now what would that drop in interest rates do? Well, it would help each one of us. A drop in interest rates would effect every individual in America and every family. A 2-percent drop in interest rates—and incidentally I just did not pick 2 percent arbitrarily. That is a number that came from Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. It came from Alan Greenspan himself.

He said that a 2-percent drop in interest rates would, on a 30-year mortgage of \$75,000, save \$37,000 over the life of that mortgage. On a college loan, a 10-year loan at \$11,000 would save \$2,160. For a 4-year car loan for \$15,000, it would save \$900. A significant savings for each family of approximately \$2,300 per year.

So why is this a problem? Well, I think it is a problem because the President just does not think he can balance the budget, and the reason is he has members in his Cabinet who are really unable to control their own budget.

For example, we have Secretary O'Leary at the Department of Energy. Now first it started out with the GAO report that said it was an ineffective agency. Then there was Vice President Gore in his national performance review that said she was 20 percent behind in her milestones, missing one out of five projects, she was 40 percent inefficient, it was going to cost us \$70 billion over the next 30 years. Well, then we found out that she travels extensively. She is the most expensive member in the whole Cabinet.

□ 2145

Then she spent \$46,500 to hire a private investigative firm to find out who her unfavorables were, unfavorable people, so she could work on them a little.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Could you repeat that?

Mr. TIAHRT. She spent \$46,500 a year to hire a private investigative firm to find out who the unfavorables were.

Mr. Speaker, with people like that, it is going to be difficult for the President to balance the budget.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Before the next speaker begins, the Chair wishes to apologize for having misread its list of speakers. The Chair will attempt to be as fair as possible and rotate between the majority and the minority, but the Chair apologizes for the mix-up.

TRIBUTE TO HERB KENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise tonight to pay tribute to a great Chicagoan, a personal friend, and a good friend to many, Chicago radio personality Herbert Rogers Kent—"the Cool Gent"—on the occasion of his induction into the Radio Hall of Fame and on the celebration of his 50 years of dedicated entertainment and service to Chicago and the surrounding communities.

Herb's many innovative and outstanding accomplishments include the development of varied fictional radio characters such as "The Waahoo Man," "the Grunchuns," "the Gym Shoe Creeper," "Rodney Roach," "the Electric Crazy People," "the ever cunning, Cadillac-driving Rudolph," and many others. Herb is also credited with coining the phrase "Dusty Records".

Throughout the 1960's and 1970's, Herb was a fixture at virtually every high school hop in the city of Chicago. The popularity of these hops extended to colleges and universities throughout the State of Illinois. While at radio station WVON, Herb broadcast live from a different high school each Friday night. The records he played would race to the top of the charts.

The Cool Gent's talents extend far beyond spinning LP's at clubs and radio stations. With his own unique flair, Herb has demonstrated a genuine commitment to his community by orchestrating a number of successful public service campaigns. Among these was the "Stay in School Campaign." For 15 minutes each day in the 1960's, Herb would speak directly to his young listeners. "If you don't stay in school," he told them, "you're cutting your own throat." When Dr. Martin Luther King made what was to be his last appearance in Chicago, Herb Kent joined Stevie Wonder the master of ceremony at the event in Soldier's Field.

Herb Kent "The Cool Gent" holds a special place in the small circle of this country's radio luminaries that include Wolfman Jack, Dick Clark, and Casey Kasem.

Herb's latest honor follows a career filled with recognition for his good work from such esteemed organizations as the Chicago Urban League and the Midwest Radio Association.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Herb Kent for sharing his gift with all

of us. I am pleased to enter these words of tribute and congratulations into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

AN UNNECESSARY SHUTDOWN OF
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today is the fourth day that the Federal Government of the United States has been shut down because this Congress has failed to complete its work in a timely manner. Our national economy is suffering as a result, the dollar is down against every other national currency and nearly 3.5 million Americans have been adversely affected by our failure to act. That does not include the number of Federal employees who have been furloughed or asked to work without knowing when they will be paid next.

I have introduced a resolution to require the House to work this coming Sunday instead of taking a vacation day. We should stay here in session, and we should be doing our voting, and a clean continuing resolution passed so that the American people do not have to start another work week with the Federal Government closed.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Just one question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to inquire of my friend, the gentleman from Maine, is it not true that the President could end this right now with a stroke of his pen on the continuing resolutions that have been sent, instead of vetoing those resolutions?

Mr. BALDACCI. I think the President does not have the second continuing resolution, but my understanding is that the resolution that has been set forth is still in the Senate. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, is it not also true that this Government would still be in operation had the President not wielded the veto pen earlier this week?

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was that the President constitutionally has the authority to veto measures. That is his constitutional provision. To hold the President hostage unless he accepts your scheme in order to balance the budget and provide large tax breaks, is to hold the President hostage and the rest of the Government hostage to the scheme that you are trying to put forth on this country.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I can assure the

gentleman personally there is no scheme. We are simply trying to balance the budget for our children and for future generations and to assure Medicare and prosperity for seniors.

Mr. BALDACCI. I would just like to ask a question. Is there a \$245 billion tax break over 7 years in your budget, your 7-year budget?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Yes, for children primarily for a \$500 tax break per child.

Mr. BALDACCI. It is not just children.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would also point out it goes to 80 percent of the American people, not to the wealthy.

FACTS AND NUMBERS OF THE
REPUBLICAN BUDGET BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing this argument about huge tax cuts, huge tax breaks to super-rich people at the expenses of the poor. I would like to present to you, I would like to give this chart to the people in California. They all know me. I was an engineer prior to becoming a Congressman. I know how to deal with the facts and numbers, because numbers do not lie. You will be shocked to find out what I am about to say tonight.

Let us take a look at this. Rich people are not paying their share. Let us take a look at this. The top 50 percent of income earners of the American people have paid more than 95 percent of the entire national income tax. The bottom 50 percent only pay 4.8 percent, hardly anything.

Look at the share of income. The income share is only 85 percent, but their tax burden is much higher. Here, it is the exact opposite. The bottom 50 percent do not pay any tax at all, practically, no taxes. Only the top 50 percent are paying taxes. Do not tell me that people are not paying their fair share.

Who is rich? Here it is. Here are people that are all rich. In the definition of our liberal friends, rich is anybody who makes more than \$21,000 a year, is considered rich. Anybody who has a job is considered rich. Is this shocking to you?

Let me go to the next one. Let us take a look at what happened in the last 10 years. Back 10 years ago, the top 50 percent, they only paid that much. Look at what happens now. Their tax share has gone up every year for the last 10 years. Look at the bottom 50 percent. Their tax share has actually declined.

In other words, these folks are paying less and less taxes each year, and the top 50 percent are paying more and more tax each year. If this trend continues, then what is going to happen? Right now it is almost a 2 to 1 ratio.

Let us take a look at these folks down here. These people have truly needed some help. I understand that.

But I cannot believe that half of the population of this country really need some help. I cannot believe that half of the population in this country really need some government help. It is hard for me to believe.

Who are these folks up here? They are the ones having children, trying to send their kids to school, support their families, having a little house and condominium, plus they have to pay for all this national defense, 2½ million fellow employees, all this, plus they have to support one more family down here. You have to support your family plus one more family down here. Do you think that is fair?

Mr. Speaker, right now it is almost a 1 point ratio, and the bottom is growing, growing, each year. Now, let us take a look at this. They are talking about a huge tax credit. What is it? A \$500 tax credit per child. That is what we are talking about, a huge tax credit to the super rich. Let me tell you who they are. The \$500 tax credit stops at incomes of \$75,000. If you make more than \$75,000 a year, you do not even get a \$500 tax credit for your child. Your child is not worth \$500. The only folks who get the \$500 credit will be right here, these folks.

Our liberal friends are screaming it is unfair, it is a huge tax credit to the rich people, because they are forgetting what is a tax credit. A tax credit means you have to pay a tax to get a credit. These people do not pay any taxes. Therefore, we cannot give them a tax credit. Do you think we should pay them \$500 in cash instead?

Second, as I mentioned earlier, the super rich. If you make \$75,000 a year you are super rich. I have been hearing this time after time, that we give a huge tax break to those folks who do not need the money. You mean they do not need the money? Why are we doing this \$500 tax credit? Because by doing it, by doing this, it can save money; by doing this, the billionaires can borrow money, create more jobs, so these folks can go up. That is the idea of the \$500 credit.

We cannot go on with this. The last 30 years, it does not work. We have to create more jobs to help these folks, so these people can go up to being the tax-paying group, instead of the tax-consuming group.

AN INJUSTICE CENTERED ON SILENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we can have a legitimate dispute over matters such as that which we just heard, knowing a different perspective on some of these issues, knowing that the whole idea of middle class to at least one of our Republican colleagues was that those who earned even as much as \$183,000 were lower middle class, but there are some issues that ought to go

beyond partisanship. They ought to go beyond differences in philosophy. I think we have seen one of those issues presented in this House tonight.

Of the many injustices that have occurred on the floor of this House this year, none, certainly, is any greater than what which we saw tonight. I refer to an injustice not based on what was said here on the floor of this House, but on what was not said.

Usually when people on one side or the other complain about an injustice, they are talking about a vote that was taken and many speeches and debate, as we have had here today. But this was the muzzling of debate. This was the gagging of debate. This was an injustice that centered on silence, not on anything that was said. This injustice related to the handling of a privileged resolution that was presented here on the floor of the House tonight, presented by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. HARRY JOHNSTON and Mr. PETERSON. It concerned a very important matter, that being the ethical standards that prevail in this House or do not prevail in this House.

The timing of the consideration of this resolution was interesting, at the end of a long day of debate. The timing of this resolution seemed to be designed, along with the motion to table that immediately cut off consideration of this measure, immediately cut it off without any presentation of the kind of debate that we are seeing here tonight on matters concerning the budget, and yet, which go to the core of the operation of this Congress; that is, the confidence of the American people in the integrity of this body.

Let me just read to you, since it was done so hurriedly, and without any opportunity for debate, from this resolution:

"Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is currently considering several ethics complaints against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH"—and indeed, they are, there have been a number of such complaints—"and whereas the committee has traditionally handled such cases by appointing an independent nonpartisan outside counsel," a procedure which has been adopted in every major ethics case since the committee was established, and, indeed, that is also accurate; in fact, on at least nine occasions, including Speaker Jim Wright, an independent counsel was appointed—"and whereas, although complaints against Speaker GINGRICH have been under consideration for more than 14 months," for 14 months, for every day of this great revolutionary new Congress those complaints have been pending and nothing has happened, "this committee has failed to appoint an outside counsel, and whereas the committee has also deviated from other longstanding precedents and rules of procedure, including its failure to adopt a resolution of preliminary inquiry before calling third-party witnesses and receiving sworn testimony,"—and in the section

of the resolution, of course, referring to the rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct which, based on the news reports, have not been complied with.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield for a moment.

Mr. DOGGETT. For a question, certainly.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that each one of these complaints that has been brought against the Speaker of the House has been brought by a Member of the opposite party, the Democratic Party, the minority party?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is correct that we have yet had an opportunity to discuss these complaints, and, yes, they have. And the whole thrust of this resolution is to have someone who is neither Democrat nor Republican participate in an independent consideration of those complaints to find out if they have been partisan or nonpartisan. And, as the resolution so indicates, whereas these procedural irregularities and the unusual delay in the appointment of an independent outside counsel have led to widespread concern that the committee is making special exceptions for the Speaker of the House; and, whereas the integrity of the House depends on the confidence of the American people, and the fairness and impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; therefore, be it resolved that the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should report to the House no later than November 28, 1995, concerning first, the status of the committee's investigation of the complaints against Speaker GINGRICH; the committee's disposition with regard to the appointment of a nonpartisan outside counsel and the scope of the counsel's investigation; and, finally, a timetable for committee action on the complaints.

That is to say, that the resolution did not go so far as to actually demand the immediate appointment of an outside counsel, but only that the committee come forward and report on what it has been doing throughout this year. Yet, Mr. Speaker, every Republican who voted refused to have even an investigation reported to this House on this critical ethical matter.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it not the longstanding tradition and, in fact, the rules of the House that no Member is to discuss the workings of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct? Are these not rules that were adopted under previous Democratic Congresses, and it is not legitimate for Members to discuss the internal workings of the Committee on Standards of

Official Conduct on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct and the Chair will read from page 526 of the House Rules manual under rule number XIV:

Members should refrain from references in debate to the official conduct of other Members where such conduct is not under consideration in the House by way of a report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or a question of privilege of the House.

The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what in the rules prevents a Member of this House from discussing an action that has taken place on the House floor? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is not discussing what is occurring in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The gentleman is discussing what is happening on the House Floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The discussion of the pendency of matters before the Standards committee is not in order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is the Chair suggesting that it is out of order to discuss a matter which occurred on the House floor? Because that is the action to which the gentleman's remarks were referring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is placing words in the Chair's mouth. That was not the Chair's response. The response was that the statements that the gentleman from Texas was making referring to matters currently before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct are not in order.

All the Chair is stating at this point is that for further purposes of discussion this evening, if a point of order is raised, there should be no further such discussion as the gentleman from Texas raised.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, then is it the ruling of the Chair that the resolution that the House just voted to table on the floor of this House concerning the desire for a report from the committee, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, is improper and cannot be discussed even during special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is simply stating that in response to the parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the references that the gentleman from Texas made in discussing that resolution went beyond reciting its consideration. That is the very limited extent of the Chair's response.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, so, the Chair is not saying that the resolution itself, which I read from throughout the course of my remarks, would not be the proper subject of debate here in the course of special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution was considered as a question of the privileges of the House—

Mr. DOGGETT. And so it is a proper subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And is no longer at this time under consideration by the House, based on the action of the House previously today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Texas entitled to discuss action which took place on the House floor? Is there any action that takes place on the House floor that any Member of this House is not allowed to refer to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin begin again, the Chair was preoccupied looking up the rule in the manual.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am simply asking if the gentleman from Texas is within the rules of the House if he continues to discuss a matter which occurred on the House Floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not issue anticipatory rulings. The Chair simply responded to the parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The 5 minutes of the gentleman from Texas having expired, there is no longer anything before the Chair to consider, and the Chair will not and cannot issue anticipatory rulings.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, because the Chair has ruled, if I understand it, in response to the parliamentary inquiry that certain remarks would not conform with the rules of the Chair, and since all of my remarks centered on reading a privileged resolution that the House had just tabled, is it the ruling of the Chair that because the resolution was tabled, it is not proper for consideration here since it dealt with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and pending business?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only to the extent that the gentleman's remarks went beyond that.

Mr. DOGGETT. So, reading the resolution would be within the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution has, in fact been tabled—

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that it has been tabled. That is what I have been talking about the last 5 minutes. My inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not a discussion of the action in tabling that resolution, and my reading of the resolution that was tabled, would be within the rules of the House, because your previous response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggests otherwise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The content of the resolution is not the proper

subject for debate in this House when it is no longer pending, and it is no longer pending.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, is it proper to read verbatim, without any commentary whatsoever, a resolution which has been tabled by the House, in a special order after regular business has ended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not if the text of the resolution itself involves official conduct.

Mr. HOKE. So, Mr. Speaker, reading the text verbatim of a resolution which has been tabled pertaining to a matter before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is, in fact, out of order after it has been tabled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chair is not, however, ruling that it is out of order for any Member of this House to address any action taken by the House on this floor, is the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is making no global rulings.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think what the Chair is saying is that the gentleman can proceed if he is not discussing the committee, but discussing floor action.

THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT: A HISTORIC VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, in listening to the closing debate by our very able chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I was struck by his comments acknowledging the many people who have been working for so many years to enact or to present to this floor for a vote, finally, a Balanced Budget Act.

In listening to Chairman KASICH's comments, it struck me at this very moment how rare of an honor it is indeed for me to be here today to have cast a vote on such a historic piece of legislation. In fact, it is this very legislation which embodies the very principles that I campaigned on just 12 months ago.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 represents the essence of what I believe in: a fiscally sound and responsible Federal Government that passes on a better America to its future generations. This truly for me is a defining moment in our Nation's history.

The Balanced Budget Act is not a smoke-and-mirrors sham in an attempt to fool the electorate. This budget is a real, honest plan that offers the people we serve the first balanced budget in a

quarter of a century. This bill is, in my opinion, right for New Jersey, but more importantly, right for America.

Throughout the debate leading up to today's historic vote we have witnessed a debate between two competing visions. On the one side are the advocates of the status quo, and on the other a group of legislators committed to offering real solutions to real problems.

Sadly, the advocates of the status quo have only been able to offer us echoes of the very sentiments that put our country in the red to begin with. Their answers to the very real questions and problems we are faced with are disappointingly and simply more of the same.

They believe that more spending, more taxes, and more debt are the answer to our budget ills. Most regrettably, during this debate the supporters of the status quo have fueled the fires of skepticism and despair, choosing to resort to demagoguery and doomsday scenarios at a time when our constituents deserve more.

As we stand on the threshold of truly monumental reform, it is only natural to experience a certain amount of anxiety about what comes next. But real leadership demands, in my opinion, that the response to that anxiety be hard work and commitment, not homage to the failed policies of the past.

Mr. Speaker, today we delivered where others have failed. Only in 1992, our non-President and then-candidate promised a balanced budget, the end of welfare as we know it, and a middle-class tax cut. We have been denied every one of these by the President and his Congress.

Today, we represent the very opposite. Today we will balance, and did balance, the budget for the sake of our children and their future. We have offered real, credible welfare reform and we will deliver a middle-class tax cut.

In short, today in passing the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, we are offering the President, by signing this bill, the opportunity to fulfill his major campaign pledges in one fell swoop. And sadly, again, he appears once more to be poised to reject his own campaign promises.

Finally, I would like to comment for a moment about the subject of Medicare. Unquestionably, in my opinion, the politics of this issue were best explained in the November 16 edition of the Washington Post editorial when it said the following: "The Democrats, led by the President, choose instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors. They have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that's where the votes are and the way to derail the Republican plans generally."

Sadly, I must agree with those comments. In defense of the status quo, we have seen only politics and not leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks I visited the veterans in my dis-

trict and over that time I have been repeatedly reminded of how impressed I am each time with their courage in the face of real adversity and dangerous crises as those that they have faced.

They were successful in their battles and kept America safe from a dangerous world, but history has shown us that great civilizations fall victims to the crisis from within just as often as they fall prey to the threats from without. The threats from within might not be tangible or have a face or a name readily associated with them, but they do, in fact, exist.

Mr. Speaker, the deficit is just such a threat. Through it may not be apparent to Americans in their everyday lives, the effects of the deficit spending and out-of-control growth in the Federal Government pose a real, real danger for America. We in Congress are charged with the duty of dealing with these problems, which is what the debate was about today.

Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to figure out what the people want and deserve. They do not want us to blink. They want us to go forward. They do want us to pass along to their children a future filled with prosperity and hope, not debt and despair.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and humbled to be a part of this historic vote today, after only 11 months ago coming to this House.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the budget bill we just passed gives a hand and a handout to the well-connected and well-off and uses a fist and brute force against the poor and many of those who work in America.

It provides for drastic and extreme changes in the lives of our citizens, and it does so through a process that was not open—a process that evolved in the dark shadows of smoke-filled, back rooms.

The Republicans would have us accept that Secret Report so that they can glide to a balanced budget in 7 years—But, "to balance" means "to equalize". And, we will not equalize, when we give a \$245 billion tax break to the wealthy while Student loans are cut, nutrition and child care are compromised, farm programs are thrown out the window, spending for needed housing programs is reduced, and Medicare and Medicaid are slashed.

We can and we should balance the budget. But, we do not need a budget that is a war without bullets.

The issue is not about balancing the budget—it is about balancing our priorities.

I voted for a 7-year balanced budget plan offered in the coalition alternative budget. But, as we glide towards a balanced budget, we should not slide through the cracks and crevices of Con-

gress, creating a clandestine, trillion dollar spending package that helps the rich among us and hurts the rest among us.

All Americans are created equal. We must not forget that fundamental premise of our Government as we shape a basic budget for the United States.

Let's give a hand to all Americans, a handout to those who need it and use a fist on real enemies. Americans who earn \$28,000 dollars or less a year are no different than those who earn \$100,000 dollars a year.

Why can't we balance the budget by giving some tax relief to the low earners and taking back some tax relief from the high earners. That is what balancing means.

Why can't we balance the budget by helping our senior citizens, who have labored a lifetime, instead of helping those who already have money to get more money—that is what balancing means.

The Republicans have established in this Congress—a record that supports the wealthy and neglects those most in need.

This budget plan—a plan that takes from the poor and gives to the rich will succeed, if we do nothing.

They want to spend money on the wealthy and call it an investment, while taking money from school children, pregnant women, infants, farmers, the poor, students and seniors and call it savings.

Our priorities seem out of order.

They have gone too far in cutting school lunches—They have gone too far in shutting off heating assistance for senior citizens—They have gone too far in eliminating scholarships and in cutting loans for college students—They have gone too far in eliminating summer jobs—and, they have gone too far in denying baby formula to infants.

Huddled beneath the dim street lamps, in the counties and towns and cities of this state, and across the Nation, are people who are outside.

They are the sick, the frail, the disabled, the poor, the weak, the old, our children—the least among us. This Budget Reconciliation Bill will keep them on the outside. And, toiling on the farms and in the factories and in small and medium sized businesses, are the people who are also outside—outside of the bounty of this Nation, despite their hard work. This Budget Reconciliation Bill will keep them on the outside.

I urge my colleagues both Democrats and Republicans who want to give a hand to the majority of our citizens—to the poor and to average, hard-working, taxpaying Americans—and who want to find a fist to crush this unrevealed conference report for a select few—I urge you to join me in supporting the President's veto of this report.

This Reconciliation Bill is a war without bullets because—while there are no weapons nor bloodshed—it does the same kind of harm to the lives of millions of Americans.

This Reconciliation Bill is a war without Bullets because—while there are no war torn streets and bombs echoing in the air—it will, if it stands, leave a stinging scar on the hearts and in the minds of our citizens.

Let's pass a budget reconciliation bill that serves all of our citizens.

□ 2215

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask the gentlewoman in the wake of her statement that the tax breaks are allegedly going to the wealthy if the gentlewoman considers 80 percent of American families wealthy?

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me, Republicans and Democrats, when we get a chance to support the President when he vetoes this because this is a bad budget for Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BARR]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RAMSTAD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HOUSE SHOULD REMAIN IN SESSION THROUGH SUNDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the new members of Congress this year, I am pleased to say that I think we have made some positive changes in this 104th Congress. There has been some things that I have been proud to support, reforms that have been made. I have been proud to reach across the other side of the aisle with some of my colleagues in the Republican Party to support some of those changes. People back in western Pennsylvania told me when I was running for office that good ideas come on both sides of the aisle. When something benefits western Pennsylvania and our country, I do not care if it is a Republican idea or a Democratic idea, we should support that. I have been happy to do that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the unsettling fact is that partisan wrangling and political staging are starting to delay the appropriations process. We are behind on paying the Nation's bills. Of the 13 appropriation bills, we have only completed work on 4 of them so far. And 800,000 Federal workers were furloughed on Tuesday and remain off their jobs and wondering if or when they will be able to pay their bills.

Millions of Americans are seeing an unprecedented Federal Government shutdown that, if it persists, will cripple

the ability for the American people to move forward, to prosper, to be proud of the service that they receive from their government.

Americans, what they are starting to see here, they do not like on either side of the aisle. They see disagreements on the budget, but our disagreements are not on whether or not to balance the Federal budget. They are on budget priorities. They see petty fights about state funerals, about which adding machine will get used, who gets credit in the public opinion polls, who gets blamed or the stories of the mere childishness in this institution. And they are seeing it taken to extremes.

The American people want to see us be serious about facing the problems in front of us. This Congress, not the President, has an obligation to keep the government in business. Yesterday I visited with 70 students from western Pennsylvania, from Brentwood High School. They were here to visit the Nation's Capitol and see some of the Nation's treasures that we have to offer. They were not able to see a lot of those treasures because we are in a shutdown right now. That fault lies with the American Congress, with the Congress here, Democrats and Republicans, because we need to get our work done. We need to do our job because we hold the purse strings.

I would like nothing better than to be home this week with my wife Susan and my four children. I think every Member in this House would like to be home with their families. But there are thousands of families nationwide who rely on the sole providers who work in this government and they, too, deserve to have the knowledge of whether or not they are going to receive a paycheck. And there are millions of families throughout the country who rely on the services that the government employees provide.

I would just like to talk a minute about the balanced budget because we hear a lot of talk about the balanced budget. I am a Democrat who voted for the balanced budget amendment. I am a Democrat that supported the Stenholm budget resolution. There were over 300 of us that agree that we should balance the Federal budget. This is not a question about whether or not to do it. The argument is going to be about how we do it. It is going to be about priorities. It is going to be about whether we have tax cuts or whether we mitigate some of the pain in Medicare and Medicaid. I think we should have that discussion.

I respect Members on this side of the aisle that feel deeply held convictions that there should be a \$245 billion tax cut and what they are doing in Medicaid and Medicare. I happen not to agree with these gentlemen and I hold those convictions sincerely. That is what we should be talking about over these next months.

Let us get this CR behind us. Let us get the government running again and then let us sit down and have the great

debate that the American people want us to have on what our priorities should be for Federal dollars. Let us get on with our work.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in place of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me to listen to the discussion on the floor this evening, particularly the suggestion that we might work over the weekend to do something, I am not quite sure. I have to confess that this is day 4 of the President's decision to shut down the Federal Government. But I would emphasize that it is the President's decision. Basically, I want to try to simplify things for Members to understand exactly what the issues are that we are now confronting.

Last Wednesday was a defining moment. It was a defining moment for the administration and it was a defining moment for the Congress. It was a defining moment for the administration because finally the administration made it clear that they are not in support of a balanced budget, period. And it was a defining moment for the Congress because 277 Members, including 48 Democrats, made it clear that we were in fact in favor of a balanced budget along the lines of the 7-year time frame.

For those who might be confused about exactly what is happening, Wednesday, when the President indicated that he was going to veto a clean continuing resolution, I realize that is Washington talk, what a clean continuing resolution means is a clean continuing resolution.

What is a continuing resolution? It is a resolution of the Congress that will allow spending to continue until early December. It had one requirement built into the resolution, that was that if the President accepted the agreement that he would in effect work with us to achieve a balanced Federal budget over the next 7 years.

There was no other requirement in that resolution. There were no tax cuts in that resolution. There were no adjustments in Medicare spending or Medicaid or any one of the hundreds of programs that we have worked our way through over the last 6 or 10 months. It was a clean continuing resolution; that is, it was unornamented. There was nothing complex about it.

We gave the President the opportunity to continue the operations of

Government just based on one caveat; that was that we are going to balance the Federal budget.

Today we did something.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, did the sentence requiring a balanced budget by the year 2002, did it say anything about tax cuts?

Mr. LONGLEY. It said nothing about tax cuts. It said nothing about spending cuts. All it said was that we, the Congress of the United States, will work with the administration to develop a balanced Federal budget, scored by the Congressional Budget Office over the next 7 years.

Mr. HOKE. So when you clear it all away, it boils down to the President very clearly saying, I will not balance the budget in 7 years?

Mr. LONGLEY. That is exactly the issue.

We have also got a second item.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, now that the gentleman has reached the point in his presentation where he is taking questions, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will yield for a question to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, why has not the continuing resolution, if the gentleman is so eager for the President to act on it, why is he holding it up?

Mr. LONGLEY. Reclaiming my time, I think that the President's indication that he was going to veto it before it was even passed resulted in it going through the Senate and it has been passed yesterday, I am advised by the Senate. I am sure that by tonight or tomorrow, it will be working its way on to the White House.

But at the same time, we have now added a second act of legislation that will be finalized by the House tomorrow morning, which is that, and remember what I said, that Wednesday we are giving the President, we voted on a clean continuing resolution. No ifs, ands, or buts, just we are going to agree to balance the budget. No adjustments in spending, no cuts, nothing.

Tomorrow morning we are going to vote on a budget, a 7-year budget. So we are going to give the President two choices. If he wants to work with us to develop a balanced Federal budget over the next 7 years, we are going to start from scratch. But by the same token, if he wants us to do the heavy lifting, we have already done it, worked our way through the budget, and we have come up with a package that we think is pretty strong. So he has got plan A and plan B. So as far as the work that needs to be done in this House, I might also add that the President's decision on Wednesday to indicate that he had no intention whatsoever of balancing the Federal budget has also thrown us into a little bit of a quandary, because if the President is going to interfere

with what we thought was his objective, which we thought was the objective of all Members of this Chamber to work toward a balanced Federal budget, and he has decided not to do that, well then now we have got to go through more programs and more adjustments and deal with the appropriations knowing they are going to be vetoed.

□ 2230

WE SHOULD STAY AND DO OUR WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, is as obvious, I think, to all of us in this House and has been for the 10 months that I have been here, as have many of my colleagues who are on the floor tonight, we disagree, and reasonable people often disagree. But I think there is one thing that we cannot disagree upon and one thing that the American people will not disagree with, and that is simply that we should stay and do our work.

The fact of the matter is that we are still getting paid when a lot of people are not getting paid, and the fact of the matter is that we get paid a lot as compared to the majority of the American people, and I think the American people want action, not talk, and most of all I think the American people would rather see us stay in Washington and try and work out our differences on this budget, get us to a balanced budget, rather than adjourn and go home. That is what we get paid to do, and we ought to stay and do it.

Now tonight I join with my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Maine [Mr. BALDACC], and my other colleagues in the freshman Democrat class to introduce a resolution which will say that we will stay in session until we get this issue resolved.

Now we can talk about the issues of clean CR's, and time frames, and CBO, and OMB, and all other acronyms which make Washington tick, but the fact of the matter is that they are all irrelevant unless we are willing to sit here, work out our differences and get on with our business. To basically take our bat and ball and go home because we are mad and not do our work puts us in about the same league as major league baseball players who were out making \$4 million or \$5 million a year and decided they did not want to play baseball because they are not making enough money. American people feel we make too much money, and sometimes I think they are right, if we are to willing to sit down, try and find common ground and address these issues.

Mr. Speaker, we can all dig in our heels, we can all say we will not give an inch, but that is not what we were sent here to do, that is not what this democracy is all about.

Now I will tell my colleagues that I think that, if we decide to leave, without finishing our business, we will have a lot to pay, and quite frankly it will be deserved, so I think our colleagues on both sides of the aisle would be well served to join with us and join with us in this resolution. Let us tell the leadership, let us tell the Speaker, that we wish to stay.

Now let me, let me just make a couple of points of clarification since I have been sitting on this floor listening to my good friends from all over the country, and I want to make two points that I think the gentleman from Kansas spoke with earlier. He made the point about the Speaker's airplane problems, and I just want to make a point to remind him, and the way that I read it in all of the newspapers, was that it was the Speaker who brought up the issue of the airplane and why as a result of his personal offense that he took he decided to make the CR harder so it would not pass. In fact I heard a tape of that last night on the nightly news. It was the Speaker who said I am just doing this for point of clarification.

Let me also make another point to my colleagues because this is something that I just have an interest in. When we talk about interest rates, and he was talking about Chairman Greenspan of the Federal Reserve, an unelected position, but certainly an expert in the area of macroeconomics, he talks about lowering interest rates, but I might point out that when the Congress threatened to default for the first time in our history as a Nation to destroy our creditworthiness, interest rates actually went up because the market reacted to that. This goes to say any time you play around with the creditworthiness of a nation, you will pay more in interest rates.

So that brings me back to where we are. Let us sit down at the table, and let us get our work done. Let us not go home. Let us not go home because we are mad. We get paid to work. Other people are not getting paid, and let us get to work. So I ask my colleagues to join me in the resolution.

BALANCING THE BUDGET IS NOT A POPULARITY CONTEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. I appreciate that. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] that, you know, all this talk about working, and we could work, and we should have this resolution to work. The fact is this House agreed, we agreed, on a continuing resolution that is clean. We did that. We make it clean, and we voted on it.

You may have even voted for it, Mr. BENTSEN. Forth-eight of your colleagues did.

Mr. WAMP. Reclaiming my time, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I was fascinated to hear a minute ago when we heard about interest rates rise. Interest rates are rising because we have the Secretary of the Treasury that is down looting the pension funds of the country, and guess what? The markets are beginning to respond to the looting action taking place by the Secretary of the Treasury. I mean it is absolutely fascinating to hear these people come out defending what is going on in the administration when what we have is a looting of the retirement funds—

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield for 1 moment, and I would just point out that the stock market is now—

Mr. WAMP. Mr. HOKE, let me reclaim my time and make my point, if I could, please.

You know, this has been a long and difficult year. It has been 11 months nearly now, and a lot of people are tired in this Chamber, and I can tell it on the floor today, and I can tell it with people's tempers, and what I would just respectfully come and say to our Members from both sides of the aisle is try not to be so disingenuous with your comments and your positions. This business of coming to the floor tonight and saying we should somehow stay on Sunday when on Sunday there is probably not going to be anything to vote on.

Let me tell you that beginning in 1991 I began running for the U.S. Congress, and I decided early on that I was not going to sacrifice my commitment to my wife and my children by entering the public arena, and I said I will not campaign, I will not do anything on Sunday, except go to my church, worship the God that I serve, and spend that day every week with my family, with my wife and my children, and I have not backed down on that commitment in 4 years.

In the first race the incumbent said we will debate you if you want to debate. She had a tremendous advantage. She said we will debate you on Sunday night, and I turned down that network-televized debate because I was not going to back down on a commitment that I made to live a balanced life of mind, body, and spirit, and I think it is very disingenuous for Members to down here and talk about us staying. We are staying tomorrow, we are staying Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here. I left home at 6:30 Monday morning, and we are staying Saturday. We are staying Saturday, and we are working, and we are going to go home for one day so I can go to my church with my children and spend a day with my family that I love.

There is a problem with the continuing resolution, there is a problem here,

we all know it. All week long we have heard about policy and popularity. Well, let me just say this, please. It is popular, and it has been popular for years, to overpromise and overspend, and even if it is not popular today to do what we have got to do to save this country from the train wreck that we are destined to have if we do not turn around, even if it is unpopular, I am willing to do it, and many of my colleagues are willing to do it.

This should not be a popularity contest. This country has got to quit worrying about polls, and how they run them, and what the results are.

Thankfully my district did respond this week. It was four to one all week in favor of what we are doing in standing tough, standing firm, on a balanced budget. One day it was six to one.

But what really bothers me is that we are the only generation in the history of this great Nation that is going to leave this place in worse shape than we found it. I would like to retire when I am 75 or 80 years old, and I would like to sit there with my grandkids and know that we did the right thing in 1995, that we stood in the gap for their future, that we made some tough decisions, that we did not back down when it all of a sudden got a little hot, like they done since 1969, said they were going to do it, got there, and we had a little pressure, and they had to back away from it, and the conservative Democrats over here, my hats are off to you. Forty-eight of you joined me, defected from President Clinton's commitment not to balance the budget, and joined us, and there are more every hour coming over. Why? Because it only makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, we have a reasonable proposal. We have stripped it down to the bare essentials of the 7-year balanced budget. It is time to move. It is time to do it. If not now, when? If not now, when are we going to do it?

I want to stay until the budget is balanced; that is what I came here for. We have got to take a step and come forward. I did not come here to play games. This is not a Republican-Democrat thing; it is a liberal and conservative thing, and we need to come together.

A CONGRESS THAT PRAYS TOGETHER CAN FINISH ITS BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker knows and, I think, the American people know, we are not here doing actual business tonight. This is a time after our colleagues have gone home where those of us who want to stay until 11 or midnight can stand here and kind of pop off, and speak our minds, and I do not usually do that, but I did want to do it tonight because I feel strongly about something.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the civic lessons from the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] on how we got here, and I think it is important that we did that because the public, they do not know what a CR is, and most people do not, and I did not before I got elected and took office this year. But he stopped short of the civic lesson because the real reason why we need this emergency measure to keep the Government open is the fact that we have not done our job. We have to pass 13 appropriations bills, and we have only gotten three to the President's desk, and because of what we have to have these emergency measures.

Now I think it was my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE], who mentioned that there are very serious disagreements on what we should do in this budget. I think there is general agreement that we need to have a balanced budget. There is very strong disagreement over how we should do that, what the spending priorities should be, whether it should be 7 years or 10 years. All of those things need to be resolved, and we should have debates over them, but they should not in my opinion be resolved in a crisis mode. We should do that in the ordinary budget process, and that is why I came here at a quarter to 11 tonight, to pop off because I think that we ought to stay through the weekend and keep working.

Now I remember when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, mentioned this. He was asked about this a few days ago, and he said, well, Sunday is the Sabbath, and we need to go to church, and I looked up, and there was our Chaplain, Reverend Ford, and I thought we got a chaplain. Maybe we should take our chaplain and go out on the front lawn of the Capitol and have our service, put on our coats and have our service out there, and maybe, if we prayed together, we would have an easier time of coming to grips with the disagreements that we have.

I would like to say another thing. For some of our Members the Sabbath is Saturday, and there has been very little concern given to those individuals, and their religious beliefs, and their sacred day, and I think that that is a problem as well.

As my colleagues know, I have a 10-year-old son, and a couple days ago he said, "Now, Mommy, I do not understand this. Two weeks ago you didn't work on the—the Congress did not meet on Monday, and you didn't meet on Tuesday, and you started at 5 o'clock on Wednesday, and then you were out on Friday, and Saturday, and Sunday, and then you started in at 5 on Monday, and now the government shut down," and, you know, I did not quite know what to tell my 10-year-old son because he knows when he has not done his homework he does not get to go to the movies, when he has not cleaned up his room, he does not get to turn on the TV set. You keep working until you get your task done.

□ 2245

We have not done that. So I am here today, popping off at this special order time, because the Democrat freshman class had what we thought could be a privileged resolution. We are newcomers, we did not know you could not set the schedule with a privileged resolution, but we wanted to ask this House to go ahead and say, "Let's just meet. Let's start early tomorrow. Let's not give up at 1, like we said. Let's go to 8 or 9 or 10 at night and let's start again. Let's meet out in the front lawn with our chaplain at 8, let us pray together, and then let us come back in here and let's work all day Sunday until we get the job down, and Monday." Because we have got thousands and thousands of Americans who are waiting for this crisis to be resolved, waiting for us to pass these appropriations bills. We have got thousands of Americans who may not get a veterans check soon.

My father, who is a disabled veteran from World War II, is one of those people. Now, luckily, my father's life is not going to crumble if his disability check does not come, but he has friends from World War II, and if their check does not come, they are in tough shape, so I think we need to resolve this issue. We need to keep working.

I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are diligent people. They do not want to goof off, either. But I think we just ought to insist that we stay here, and we keep working until we have all 13 appropriations bills passed.

STAND FIRM: BALANCE THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN], and indeed, would say that on one point we can agree. The gentlewoman from California suggested that it would be appropriate for this body to meet collectively in prayer, recognizing that we may worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and do so in different fashions. I would respectfully ask that our colleagues on the democratic side join us. Indeed, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is proposing a national day of fasting and prayer, and if not this Sunday, then sometime in the future, and perhaps that is an element upon which we may agree.

The great thing, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned many times standing in the well of this House, debating many contentious issues, is this: Good people may disagree. It is championed throughout this constitutional Republic. Disagreement in itself is not

unhealthy. Debating these issues is vitally important, especially at this juncture in our history.

In the wake of the historic moment at which we find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, I thought it important to bring comments from my constituents, those who have written to me during this week. In direct contradiction of what the public opinion polls are showing us, faxes and letters to my office are running 12 to 1 in support of the majority's budget plan.

From a gentleman in Scottsdale: "Keep the faith. Don't give in. Continue to fight for a balanced budget, lower taxes, and a downsizing of the bloated Federal Government."

From a gentleman in Glendale, Arizona: "I have worked hard all my life to try to get ahead, only to have more and more of my income forcibly taken away and given to others. Some of my money even goes to pay the salaries of the very people, the IRS, et cetera, whose job it is to take my money."

From a gentleman in Chandler, Arizona: "My house is behind you completely. For those of you who disagree with a balanced budget in 7 years, well, get a grip and hold on, because that is what the American people really want." This gentleman adds, "I don't care what the polls say." In his opinion, he says, "The truth is, they are rigged to show the President's way of thinking. After all, look at who takes all those polls."

From a family in Paradise Valley, Arizona: "Please hold firm. Closing the government down for a while will not hurt the country as much as continuing the current course of overspending."

Unless there is a mistaking of the comments here, the people who wrote this letter do not rejoice in the fact that Government employees are out of work, but what they are saying has been echoed by many constituents and others who have written me from across this country. What we face right now will not hurt the country as much as the current course of overspending.

My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, put it quite eloquently: It is time to do the right thing. My good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the other side of the aisle, who has a difference on how to get there and whose differences I respect, said the same thing: The time has come to balance the budget. We should have that debate.

We may disagree as to some of the methodology, we may disagree as to some of the tactics, but the fact remains, that time is now to balance the budget.

From a gentleman in Mesa: "Most all the people I talk to support the Republicans on the budget issue. Don't cave in to the news media or to the Democrats. We hope that our representatives will do the right thing this time."

Again, my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, pointed it out, how previous Congresses, in the wake

of the last balanced budget in 1969, how previous Congresses had abdicated their responsibility. Perhaps the pressures of history and the unique time in which they served in this body forced them into another course of action. But at this time, for this House, for this country, Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. It is time to get on a glide path to a balanced budget in 7 years.

I have noted before when I have come to the well of this House that candidate Clinton in 1992 talked about a balanced budget. In an appearance on Larry King Live, he pledged to "balance the budget in 5 years."

Then, Mr. Speaker, as I stand here in the well of this House, surrounded by the echoes of history, and here at this podium, where so many chief executives have addressed this Nation, we can also recall the words of President Clinton in his first State of the Union message, and these are the words of President Clinton. "I will point out that the Congressional Budget Office was normally more conservative about what was going to happen and closer to right than previous Presidents have been. I did this so that we could argue about priorities with the same set of numbers."

Friends, let us use the same set of honest numbers. Let us balance the budget. I thank the Speaker and all my colleagues for joining me here tonight.

SUPPORT THE RESOLUTION TO KEEP THE CONGRESS IN SESSION ON SUNDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 20th Congressional District sent me here to serve, not to give up and go home. That is why I am pleased to stand with my fellow Democratic freshmen Members and support the resolution seeking to keep the Congress in session on Sunday; that is, after attending Mass.

While my wife, Dolores, and I enjoy returning to our district to be with our family and friends, and especially with my Aunt Jennie and Uncle Frank Flora, both of whom are seniors and who depend on Medicare and Social Security, while we know that is important, we cannot go home when 28,000 seniors per day cannot file for Social Security or disability benefits, or when 200,000 people per day call the Social Security 800 number and get no answer. We cannot go home when almost 8,000 veterans per day, those who stood for this country and served it in times of war, file claims for service-connected disability benefits, pensions, or the Montgomery G.I. Bill educational benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is very serious. Eight hundred thousand Federal workers all across this country have been furloughed. They are nervous and anxious, and beginning to wonder if

they are going to be able to meet their next mortgage payment, or a car payment. It is hardly fair that Members of Congress, whose pay is secure, go home for the weekend and leave these workers hanging out to dry.

Mr. Speaker, as a story in this morning's Washington Post clearly pointed out, "The shutdown is beginning to have a ripple effect." That is throughout the country. "Government contractors have not been paid, and they are beginning to lay off workers. None of the national museums are open here in Washington, DC, and the national parks across the country are losing millions of dollars in tourist trades every day as this drags on."

We must, we must settle this budget dispute, and we have to do it in a bipartisan fashion. We are never going to sit down and work out a fair, balanced agreement if we just throw our marbles into the pot and go home. That is not right. That is not right. We need to stay, and we need to stay until we can get the job done.

I know there are freshman Democrats and freshman Republicans, both of whom, behind the scenes, have tried to put together some language that would be acceptable to both sides, but we need, we need to settle this matter at once.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 1½ minutes.

THE DEMOCRAT-SPONSORED RESOLUTION; CONGRESS SHOULD STAY IN SESSION UNTIL IT COMPLETES ITS WORK

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA], for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to say as a group that we were elected to serve the public. We were elected to serve all of the public, Republican, Democrat, and Independent, and there are people who are out of work. There are veterans with disability payments that need to have their eligibility reviewed. There are people who are trying to visit Acadia National Park in Maine and many other national treasures that are told that it is closed.

This Government is shut down, people are laid off, and we feel that we should be working here because people are not working because of the actions of this body and the entire Congress, so we feel very strongly that we would rather keep working to try to bring about a resolution than trying to go back and forth, and trying to resolve this problem once and for all.

That is in the interests of all the people, whatever their ideologies are, to work together for that resolution, because every day we miss it seems like it is just that much further behind that we get. I think that is really what we are trying to achieve here.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand this. We passed a continuing resolution in the House. Obviously, the House spoke. The gentleman did not vote for it, as I understand that, but 48 of your colleagues did. We passed it. The Senate has passed it. What more work is there to do? The President has said he is going to veto it. What else is there to do with that? We have done our work.

Mr. BALDACCI. We will continue that maybe a little bit later.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak in place of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

TAKING A HARD LOOK AT THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric has runneth over ever since the Federal Government shut down 3 days ago, but the truth is in the numbers. Today's Washington Times newspaper ran the headlines on its front page: "Dow Surges Towards 5000 as Wall Street Ignores Impasse."

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that since 800,000 so-called nonessential Federal workers were placed out of the 2 million Federal work force last Tuesday, the stock market has surged. The stock market has set its consecutive record highest yesterday, Wednesday and today. One can only wonder what the market would do if we would quite stonewalling the cut in the capital gains tax rate. How high would it go if we simply eliminated the capital gains tax, just like most other industrialized nations? How much stronger would the market grow if we could cut out inheritance taxes or the marriage penalty, or reform our tax code? What if we took a hard look at the size and scope of government?

Maybe this country could survive with only 1.2 million Federal employees. Quite possibly we could get along with fewer. The American people might soon discover that they actually like not having such a huge, intrusive government. It certainly would cost less.

My office has received hundreds of telephone calls this week, as have other congressional offices. I think we have heard about a lot of those tonight. I think the overwhelming message we are all receiving is that the people we represent want us to stand firm on balancing the budget, getting this continuing resolution adopted within the 7-year period of time, and

with real good numbers through the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, I truly understand the turmoil that this standoff between Congress and the President is causing in the lives of Federal employees. We empathize with them with respect to the uncertainty they face personally. I believe that it is completely unfair to the furloughed Federal workers for the President to hold them hostage, when in the past, and I stress this, when in the past, he has agreed that the budget can be balanced in 7 years. It is also unfair of the President to hold them hostage so that his newest political consultant, Dick Morris, can boast that he is running the country.

According to the Washington Post, Mr. Morris was at his doctor's office not too long ago to get a flu shot. He was on his cellular telephone. He was overheard to have said, "I am running the country," into the phone. Who is running the country? Did we vote for Dick Morris to run the country or did we vote for President Clinton to be the President? One has to wonder when Mr. Morris is making these types of comments as a political consultant for President.

We as Members of Congress were elected to do hard things here. Especially we, as Republican Members of the freshman class, feel a very strong mandate from last November to come to Washington and to restore responsible government. Probably the cornerstone of restoring responsible government is to achieve a balanced budget within this 7-year period of time, which is a reasonable period of time to do this.

□ 2300

And to do so with good, real numbers that, as the President admits, the Congressional Budget Office affords.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would urge the President to join with us, the elected representatives of the American people, and get away from his political gurus like Mr. Morris, and take this as most serious business.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that he chose to reject, to go out and say publicly that he would veto this continuing resolution, even before we had an opportunity to send it down Pennsylvania Avenue. I think we must all rise to this occasion. It is not a time for blaming. It is not a time to talk about blinking or who is going to cave in. These are not important matters at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is most urgent, what those people on furlough would like to most see, what our people back home would like to most see, is not who blinks first, not who caves in, not who looks at the politics of this thing, but who works in a responsible fashion to join with us, as he has promised he could do in the past, to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, he said, no question about it, that he can do it in 7 years. He said he wants to use CBO numbers,

because they are the most accurate. We have that continuing resolution out there now. The Senate has passed it, but he has chosen to veto it.

I would call upon the President tonight to extend that arm, as we extend our continuing resolution, and join us halfway and meet us to sign this continuing resolution for the good of the country. Let us not get caught up in the politicizing of this budgetary process any longer.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to join with us on both sides of the aisle and help get this Government back up and running and at the appropriate time that we can begin to negotiate where we have legitimate disagreements.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate joining my colleague from Maine and the freshman Democrats who have come to this House floor seeking not only a mere opportunity for collegiality, but fairness for the American people.

I come this evening because this is an important matter before the House. I come in the name of my son, Jason, age 10, who has a Thanksgiving feast this Monday, my daughter Erica, age 15, who has a basketball tournament this weekend, and my husband.

Thanksgiving happens to be a time when most families would like to have time together. I take issue with the gentleman on the floor about this regular Sunday dates with his family. We all would like to be with our family. I would imagine that the 28,000 individuals who are applying for Social Security benefits probably need to have the Government operating, because they are in dire need.

Mr. Speaker, I would think the 10,000 claims for veterans benefits are important to those people who have given their service to this country; and, the 10,000 applications for Medicare that are not being processed also impacts seniors who have come now to a time in their life when they need medical care; and the 2,500 home mortgage applications that are not being processed.

Mr. Speaker, it happens to be very interesting. I have heard myriad comments made by my Republican friends. I think the American people need to know the facts. The Republicans are in the majority. They are the ones who are in control and they came into this Congress, along with those of us who are freshman Democrats, on January 4, 1995.

We have had now some 11 months to pass the appropriation bills that should have been passed as of October 1. Interestingly enough, we were willing in the first 100 days to do things like dismantle the crime bill. We were willing to dismantle the welfare reform package

that most of us thought we could agree with, and put some million children off the rolls in order to allow for them to be unfed and hungry. A million children that would not be able to have the benefits that they need on a welfare reform package.

They were willing to tack on the appropriation bills the elimination of affirmative action; all kinds of unrelated activities were taking up the time of Republicans, when we should have been dealing with the appropriation bills for this country.

So it amuses me, and saddens me as well, when I hear our Republican colleagues come to the House floor with such piousness. They are in the majority in this House and they have not done their jobs and the American people need to know that. They need to know when little children picket the White House because they are not able to go to the museums of this Nation that belong to them that the Republicans simply have not done their job.

If further amuses me for them to say we do not need to work this weekend. Yes, we do, because there are people in this country who will come on Monday and face another day of being unsalaried and not being able to work. Frankly, let me tell my colleagues that this continuing resolution is not at the President's desk. It is still over in the Senate. It has not gotten to his desk.

If it has not gotten to his desk, we will have Saturday and we need to be here Sunday to resolve the matter. I wish we would come down to the bare facts of what the truth actually is. We have a schism here.

We do not have a reconciliation bill. We have a bill that actually divides this country. It divides this country because it eliminates the low income house tax credit, something that helps inner cities develop affordable housing for their citizens. It reduces payments to hospitals and causes urban and rural hospitals to close.

Mr. Speaker, it increases the Medicare premium upwards of \$10 for our citizens, one of whom I heard from tonight who said she gets \$600 a month in her Social Security and she is 85 years old. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, she cannot afford the extra \$10.

In Texas, we will find that Medicaid has been reduced now to \$5 billion, reduced down to \$5 billion. We will see many of our urban hospitals, the Harris County Hospital District and the citizens that it takes care of, impacted drastically.

Then the Republicans talk about the investment for their children. They are good about talking about what is happening in the 21st century. Let me tell my colleagues the truth. They reduced R&D 35 percent. Research and development creates jobs for Americans. Then they decreased the student loans some \$5 billion. They put a thousand schools out of the direct student loan program. This is the future that Republicans offer.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to not only be here tomorrow; we need to be

here Sunday. We need to be here maybe on Thanksgiving Day, so that we have truly reflect what America is all about and there would be a real Thanksgiving, and that is a budget that reflects the needs of all working Americans, not just the talented tenth and not just the wealthy who will be getting \$245 billion in a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to be amongst those freshman Democrats who are standing here to say we are prepared to work for the American people so the doors of this Government can be open on Monday and we can serve them in the manner that they should be served.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly urge my colleagues to work throughout this weekend to resolve this budget impasse. My Democratic freshman colleagues and I introduced a resolution today that recommends that the House complete action on a continuing resolution and debt ceiling to end this budget impasse. We urged the House Rules Committee to allow this resolution to proceed to the House floor.

This crisis is taking a toll on millions of Americans, particularly Federal employees and their families. Some 800,000 Federal employees have been furloughed. They are wondering whether they will get paid for this furlough period and be able to meet the economic needs of their families.

Each day that the Government is shut down, 28,000 applications for Social Security benefits are not being processed; 10,000 claims for veterans' benefits are not being processed; 10,000 applications for Medicare are not being processed; 2,500 home mortgage applications are not being processed; 22,000 passport applications are not being processed; and 60,000 young children are unable to attend Head Start programs.

This crisis is affecting business firms that have contracts with the Federal Government and affecting localities that depend upon Federal employment to stabilize their economies.

This impasse is causing America to lose its credibility with the rest of the world, particularly among the international capital markets.

The budget impasse is unacceptable. The Members of this House were elected to do a job, which is to appropriate funds to operate the Federal Government and carry out our oversight function over Government agencies. We have failed to exercise this responsibility because the House leadership spent valuable time during this session on the "Contract With America" proposals instead of moving the appropriations bills through the legislative process.

While millions of Americans are experiencing anxiety over this impasse, Members of Congress are still being paid. Since we are getting paid, let us remain here over the weekend and resolve this crisis by passing a clean continuing resolution or pass appropriations bills without extraneous legislative riders so that the Federal Government can conduct its business.

Most Members of this House want a balanced budget. Many of us have voted for balanced budget proposals during this session of Congress. However, the budget must not be balanced on the backs of those Americans that can least afford it. There is an appropriate way to achieve this goal. We must not hold

the American people, particularly Federal employees, hostage in the process.

This is not the time for Members to focus on perceived slights by the President. This is not the time to focus on partisan politics. This is the time to act in a responsible manner and ensure that the Federal Government is up and running to serve the American people.

BUDGET IMPASSE

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to focus on not just where we are now, but how we got here. Several days the House passed and sent over to the Senate a continuing resolution which would fund every part of the Government that is now shut down, and fund it at a level that I take it the President does not object to, because he has not objected to that part of the continuing resolution.

There was only one other condition attached to it: That the President agree to balance the budget of the United States in 7 years according to realistic numbers. The President has announced, before the bill was even passed the President announced that he would veto the legislation.

Why? Because the President would shut the Government down rather than balance the budget in 7 years, and the Congress would allow the Government to be shut down rather than prevent the budget from being balanced in 7 years. A number of Members on both sides of the aisle have talked about the schism, about the philosophical differences.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TALENT. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I think that the American would say that everybody is in favor of balancing the budget, but does your proposal have a \$245 billion tax break on top of balancing the budget?

Mr. TALENT. We provide family tax relief. Is the gentleman in favor of balancing the budget in 7 years?

Mr. BALDACCI. Yes.

Mr. TALENT. Did you vote that way?

Mr. BALDACCI. Yes.

Mr. TALENT. Did you vote for the balanced budget amendment?

Mr. BALDACCI. I voted for the Stenholm budget. I voted for the Orton budget.

Mr. TALENT. Did you vote for the continuing resolution?

□ 2310

Mr. BALDACCI. I support a 7-year balanced budget.

Mr. TALENT. Did you vote for the continuing resolution?

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to understand, our balanced budget did not have tax breaks in it. I think that the proposal that you put forward did.

Mr. TALENT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Does the continuing resolution have a \$240 billion tax cut in it?

Mr. TALENT. No, I appreciate the gentleman saying that. The President has complained and several Members of this body have complained about certain parts of our budget that they do not like this aspect of it, they do not like that aspects of it.

The continuing resolution does not say the President has to accept the congressional budget, does not say the President has to accept any budget. It says the President has to agree to balance the budget in 7 years. One of the problems we have in this Congress is that instead of debating the import of the matters before us, we keep making contrary assertions about what is before us. We cannot even agree on what we are talking about.

The continuing resolution says the Government will continue if the President will agree to balance the budget in 7 years. He does not like our budget. He can offer his own. In fact, he did offer his own budget. He did offer his own budget some months ago, I believe in the form of a 22- or 24-page press release, which he claimed balanced the budget in 10 years.

This is how the Congressional Budget Office scored it. Continued deficits through another 10 years at \$200 billion. It was a budget that no Member of either party in this House would even offer on the House floor. It was offered on the Senate and it was rejected by a vote of 96 to 0.

The President is not opposed to the continuing resolution. He is not trying to get the Government to shut down because he does not like our budget. He is shutting down because he does not like our budget. He is shutting the Government down because he does not want to balance the budget in 7 years. Why does he not want to balance the budget in 7 years? About the only good thing about this controversy, Mr. Speaker, is that it does highlight the very major philosophical differences between the two parties here in Washington. The President of the United States and the leader of the Democratic Party believes basically that what is important about America is the Federal Government and its agencies and its instrumentalities, as if the United States was a pyramid with the Federal Government at the top of it. And the policies the President has followed and the national Democratic Party, not all Democrats to be sure, but the national Democratic Party have followed has sucked up that pyramid power and resources away from the American people for the last 30 years.

But our party believes in the people and what they have built, their families their communities, their neighborhoods, their local schools, serve and civil and charitable organizations. We want power and resources located in the people, and what built in their communities. And we do not want the Federal Government to bankrupt everything that the people of this country have built and have worked for for the last several hundred years.

Mr. Speaker, the President was against the balanced budget amendment. He is against the budget that we offered. He refuses to offer a serious budget of his own. And now he vetoes a continuing resolution that calls for him to do nothing except accept in principle that we will balance this budget within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, if some family or some business in the United States was awash in red ink the way the Federal Government is and their deal with their creditors and the bank was, we will get our budget balanced in 7 years, not eliminate the debt, just eliminate the deficit in 7 years, people would laugh at them. That is all we are trying to do here. That is all we need to do to get this government open. The minute the President agrees to balance the budget in 7 years, according to reasonable numbers, this Government will open for business.

MORE ON THE BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, let me begin tonight by thanking the staff of the House of Representatives for staying so late and giving us a chance to address each other and our fellow countrymen. We appreciate it. It must be very scintillating for you to listen to all of us. We appreciate that you are here.

It is a great honor and a humbling experience to serve in this body. It is something I am very proud of. But frankly, we have not brought ourselves very much honor the last couple of days by what has gone on.

Tonight I would like to talk about a question and a challenge that I would offer to everyone on both sides of the aisle as we try to struggle through the next couple of days. It must be, Mr. Speaker, thoroughly exasperating to watch what we have done the last couple days or have not done the last couple days, when you consider the fact that there is a short-term question before the Congress and a long-term question before the Congress.

The short-term question is, what do we have to do to open up the doors of the Federal Government again and get these 800,000 people back to work? Virtually everyone from both parties that comes to the floor says they want to do that. And then they degenerate into why the other side has blocked them from doing that. And I find it inconceivable that 535 Members, including us and the other body and the President, cannot come up with a sensible solution in the next couple of days that would do that.

The longer term question is, do we want to balance the budget in 7 years? The answer is an overwhelming yes. Almost 300 Members of this institution have voted to do exactly that, not in

symbol, not in political symbol, but have actually voted for a 7-year plan to balance the budget, numbers and details. And it must be equally exasperating to figure out why that has not happened, why 300 of us cannot get together and do that.

Let me offer a question and then the challenge that I talked about. The question is, I have to wonder whether the leaders of the Republican Party and frankly whether the leaders of my party at the White House really want to resolve this problem or whether they want to set themselves up for the 1996 election.

It is not too farfetched, Mr. Speaker, to think that here is what is going on. The Republican Party has had tremendous success in this country at all levels of politics by making the argument that they are the party of lower taxes and leaner Government and zero deficits, and the Democrats are the party of higher taxes and larger Government and higher deficits. They have done very well having that argument in elections. The thought occurs to me that maybe the Republican Party is better served by keeping that argument going through the 1996 election.

On the other hand, the Democrats have done well in the November 1995 elections and the public opinion polls would suggest are doing well right now with the argument that Republicans are callous to the needs of seniors and children and the environment and maybe the leaders of our party have decided that we would be doing well to keep that argument going through the 1996 election as well.

I pose the question tonight in all sincerity, without impugning the motive of any person in this House or any person in the Government, as to whether that is what is really going on, as to whether we are engaged in a huge choreographic exercise here that is simply designed to lead up to the 1996 campaign so we all have the right themes and the right sound bites. If that is the case, we are doing our country and this institution a tremendous disservice. Because there are two things at stake here that we may never again in our careers have a chance to address.

The first is the chance to reverse a 25-year flood of red ink that has put the children of this country at great risk. I believe sincerely that there will never again come in this century and maybe not for the next couple of decades an opportunity to truly balance the budget of the Federal Government. There are 300 of us here in this Chamber who are ready to do that. I do not know why we have not been able to get together and figure out a way to do that.

The other point that I would make to you, and I think is even greater significance, the credibility of politicians in general and this institution in particular was very low when this all began, and it is much lower as we stand here tonight. And I believe that what is at stake is not simply our ability to put

the fiscal house of this country in order, it is also maybe our last chance in a long time to make people believe that the political system works for them again.

I stand here tonight, 11:20, after a long day, frankly, wondering what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We are friends and classmates from the 102d Congress.

I want to respond to the gentleman's question, because I think he raises more than a rhetorical question. He makes a valid point. I have wondered what it would take to forge a bipartisan compromise on a long-term agreement to balance the Federal budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] has expired.

ON THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, to return to the colloquy with the gentleman from New Jersey, I simply want to point out that one of the concerns, one of the frustrations that I have had is that the closer we have gotten to the actual moment of truth, the moment of truth being that time which actually came today, when we voted on the final version of a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget using honest numbers, this is an agreement scored by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, it balances the Federal budget in 7 years by limiting the growth, the increase in Federal spending to 3 percent per year, the closer we have gotten to that moment of truth, the fewer Members on your side of the aisle who have been willing to stand up and cast that tough vote.

□ 2320

Now let me point out that the gentleman is the exception to the rule. The gentleman from New Jersey not only voted for the Democratic alternative, the substitute version offered by the Democrats to balance the Federal budget, he also voted for the continuing resolution a couple of nights ago, but let me point out, because I have here in my hot little hands, as they would say, the three rollcall votes that I consider most pivotal.

First is the vote the gentleman referred to as the vote earlier this year, in the first quarter of the year, on the balanced budget amendment, which was part of the Contract With America; that was rollcall vote 51 in the House of Representatives. Voting yes were 228 Republicans and 72 Democrats, including the gentleman from New Jersey.

And later, rollcall vote number 741, this was on the so-called coalition budget, the version of a balanced budget offered by the more moderate conservative Democrats which was officially offered on this floor as the Democrat substitute or the Democrat alternative on a balanced budget. Out of 199 Democrats, 68 voted for the concept and the plan for balancing the budget at that time; 131 Democrats were opposed.

And then just 2 nights ago in rollcall vote, and I have got it as well, rollcall vote number 8002 in the House of Representatives, only 48 Democrats, again including the gentleman from New Jersey, voted for the continuing appropriations which stipulated only that we would be committed, in passing that bill into law, to the concept of balancing the Federal budget in 7 years using honest CBS numbers.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the fact is this does show bipartisan support, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] has well established himself as someone who is going to work with the Republican majority to, in fact, pass a balanced budget. What we need is enough of those Democrats on the other side of the aisle to talk to the President, and the fact is we would not have these furloughs, we would not have these agencies not funded, we would not have programs stopped now, if the President would only sign a balanced budget that the said on no less than six occasions that he would sign.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the gentleman would yield, I will be very succinct. I do not want to intrude on his time.

Frankly let me try to answer your question. Here is how I think we can get the 300 votes, and everyone has their own version of this. The tax cut will be smaller, the money taken from the tax cut will be put back into Medicare. There will be a little bit more taken out of agriculture and energy, put back into the environment and education, and there is your 300 votes, and it will take us 15 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. I would like to engage you just a little bit longer on this because I think the questions you raised are more than rhetorical, and I really appreciate your sincerity, and I have to say that I reject your conclusions. I mean, cause you know you have clearly been absolutely consistent, and I looked at the votes earlier, just like FRANK did, and I think that this is not about policy—well, it is ultimately about policy, but I really do believe that it is about politics and that politics is about power, and I do not know how else you can explain the voting patterns.

You know, one of the things that I saw by looking at this is that there were 24 Members of your side who voted for the balanced budget amendment on January 26, an amendment to

the Constitution, who voted against the continuing resolution 2 nights ago. Forty-eight Members voted for it, but 24 of the ones that had voted for the BBA back in January voted against this continuing resolution. I mean how do you explain that?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming the time, I appreciate the comments of my colleague.

The fact of the matter is a balanced budget is going to help everyone in every region of the country, all ages, and the fact is by decreasing the cost of mortgage payments for the balanced budget, decreasing costs for car payments, decreasing costs of college tuition, we are going to do what every other government is required to do, school government, local government, and families.

So the balanced budget is an idea whose time has arrived. We need to have the political will to make sure we talk to the White House, that we have more of both sides of the aisle working together.

Mr. HOKE. Well, we clearly have the political will, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] clearly has the political will, but you are trying to get to the question of what is really going on, and you are saying, if we reduce some of the tax cuts, reduce some of the tax cuts and tinker a little bit with the environment and some of these educational things—I do not know who else has time here.

WE HAVE TO LEARN TO WORK TOGETHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the resolution that I put forward is a resolution so that the Congress could continue to work on Sunday, that we not take the day off, that we continue to do our work.

There are thousands of seniors who are qualifying for disability, veterans disability. There are many people who are trying to visit our national parks at Acadia and other national treasures who have been told that it is closed, and we have our work to do because we have not yet been able to open the Government back up again.

We put this together as members of the freshman Democratic Party, but we reached out in a bipartisan way to continue working, to do what is in the public interest, not in the party interest.

Mr. Speaker, as we argue the balanced budget and as we argue the balanced budget over 7 years, I stand before you as somebody who has supported a balanced budget over 7 years and supported the particulars of that balanced budget over 7 years. I voted for it twice.

The problem with what is being offered in the Congress is, is a balanced budget that incorporates \$245 billion in

tax cuts. People who are earning over \$200,000 are going to get a check for \$14,000. You are going to have to make deeper cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. You eliminate a disproportionate share from hospitals that serve communities where the poorer people are being taken care of. It eliminates and annihilates a lot of rural hospitals throughout our country. In my State of Maine we lose \$187 million over 2 years. The senior Senator from the State of Maine did not vote for the budget that was put forward by the Republicans, voted for a balanced budget that did not have tax breaks. That is the responsible approach, but that approach is not being put forward by the majority.

So do not ask us to support a balanced budget that has \$245 billion in tax breaks over 7 years. It is causing too much pain and suffering on the seniors. It causes too much pain and suffering for children. You are cutting student aid deeper than you have to.

When we put forward the balanced budget over 7 years, we took \$100 billion of the \$245 billion, put it back into Medicare, we put it back into Medicaid, student financial aid, and veterans benefits, and we did it over 7 years. So we were able to come up with a framework that got us to a balanced budget, but that did not do it with as much pain and suffering on the seniors, on health care, on kids and on people with disabilities as much as what is being proposed by the majority.

I do think that we can reach a compromise on this particular issue, I do not think we are that far apart, and I truly believe, as the gentleman has stated here before, that we can work together in that regard. There is significant support in both Chambers for that. But I think we have to work together at it. It cannot be your way or the highway. In the same way on our side it cannot be this is it or else. We truly have to communicate regularly because we have to understand that the Congress is being controlled by the majority and that the administration being controlled by the President, and they are going to have to learn to work together in the public interest.

□ 2330

We really need to force those lines of communication to open up and to continue, but I really have to tell you, the budget that has been put forth is not a good budget for America. It rolls back environmental standards. I believe that what the majority is proposing, and what I have seen people talking about, is going backwards. We want to go forward, not backward. We do not represent Government as it is, but we represent environmental standards and an easier way to get to it. We represent a student financial aid program that does not have as much regulation to it, but that gets resources out there.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a question, I think what the gentleman is saying is absolutely right. We have very honest differences about these things. Maybe some of the differences get exaggerated for political effect on both sides. What I do not understand is why you would be opposed to the continuing resolution that very clearly clarifies the only difference is in committing to a 7-year balanced budget scored by CBO. Why not that?

Mr. BALDACCI. Just to complete the question, the problem is that you take a continuing resolution, which is really, because Congress has not finished its work, and, how, I have not been here before, and they have had continuing resolutions; but because we did not finish the work, you added these items to it, which were like you were trying to do your budget approach through reconciliation and a continuing resolution. That is what made it very difficult to support that methodology. I think that had more to do with that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHY WILL THE PRESIDENT NOT SIGN THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I would continue my question to the gentleman. My question is simple. What makes this complex, to simply cast a "yes" vote, an "aye" vote on the CR? It is a clean CR as the President asked for, with one sentence. I read that sentence. It is a short sentence. It is a benign sentence. It says that the President and the Congress will honestly and sincerely work together to come up with, that they will be committed to balancing the budget in fiscal year 2002 under the scoring of CBO.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, all I am saying to him is that I do not think we are that far apart. The problem we have is that in a continuing resolution, which is because the work was not finished on time, we needed to pass it for a couple of more weeks. A lot of things, including that, were added into it, and it really was not the proper vehicle.

We have the reconciliation budget, which we voted on today, which really is the proper vehicle. That needs to go through the process, and then we should demand that the President, the Speaker, and the majority leader negotiate that budget reconciliation and work out those differences over that

budget and then come back to the Congress.

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time, I do not necessarily disagree with the gentleman, but you cannot have it both ways, then, and then blame the shut-down of the Government on the Republicans because, in fact, it is the President's veto that is shutting down the Government. And he has vetoed it, he said he has vetoed it, strictly because it has this 7-year balanced budget language in it.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I just want the gentleman to understand, I am not blaming anybody for the shut-down. I am blaming all of us. The resolution was to keep working together. It was not making any claims about the Republicans or the Democrats, but it was stating we should work together to get through this.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, if I could offer my own observation as to why we are at this point of stalemate, in all candor, I think the first continuing resolution failed because your party chose, for whatever reason, to attach issues regarding environmental regulation and Federal criminal appeal habeas corpus review, and some other things.

Mr. HOKE. It had the Medicare Part B premium. I thought that was the one the President really hung his hat on.

Mr. ANDREWS. He did, but the party chose to put veto bait on the bill.

The failure of the second resolution is the fault of our party, frankly, because I think the President chose to send a political signal to his democratic base that he would not buy into your 7-year number because that was an important symbol for his base, so strike one on you, strike two on us, so here we are with nothing.

It just occurs to me that if the five or six of us here at 11:35 tonight had the power to make this decision, I think we would make a decision that would be fair and reasonable and probably get the people back to work by Monday. I do not see why we cannot do that.

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time, I think what you have said is quite fair and correct, but I really do think that ultimately it boils down to the President not being able to live with a 7-year balanced budget and maintain his political base, and that is really what is going on. What we are talking about is \$800 billion of difference. That, really, is finally what it boils down to.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that there is a philosophical divide here that has to be dealt with. I think the proper place to deal with that is on the debate over the reconciliation bill. I think we ought to have that debate while the Government is running.

Mr. HOKE. Exactly. I totally agree with that.

Mr. ANDREWS. And we should make that resolution. Between now and Monday, and I hope we can for family reasons finish by then, but we ought to make it our mission to get that done by Monday, and I think the 300 of us who want to see a 7-year balanced budget will win, which is as it ought to be.

Mr. BALDACCI. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not think the President opposes a balanced budget over that period of time.

Mr. HOKE. Why do you say that?

Mr. BALDACCI. Let me just say, I do not think he does. When you start adding tax breaks to it—

Mr. HOKE. That is not in there. It is not in the CR.

Mr. BALDACCI. You know it is in the budget reconciliation.

Mr. HOKE. It does not go to the details, it does not say how. It just says that we will.

Mr. BALDACCI. Let me say honestly to you, so we can cut down to the chase, when you add the tax breaks to it, even among us, it makes it so that you push it so it would have to be 8 years, because you really cannot do any more in 7 years and balance the budget and make the cuts. We have through it with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and others, and it cannot be done.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not doubt that we disagree about these things, profoundly, and that they could be real problems. Maybe that means the President will veto this and we will never come to an agreement, and we will just have to keep running the budget or the Government by a CR, but the fact is that the CR does not say that. It does not say how you get there. It just says that you are committed to it. The President refused to sign that, or he says he is going to veto it. He has made it very clear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE BUDGET AND THE MEDICARE PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to vote for the Balanced Budget Act today, which included the Medicare Preservation Act. I do not want to sound like a broken record, but this bill does not cut a dime of spending on Medicare or Medicaid. In fact, both programs, in both programs, spending increases every year. Medicare spending will increase by 45 percent over the next 7 years. That is more than twice

the rate of inflation. Medicare spending in the last 7 years was \$926 billion. Over the next 7 years, we will spend \$1.6 trillion on Medicare. I defy any of my colleagues to explain to the American people how that is a cut.

The same is true for Medicaid, which has grown an astronomical 11,000 percent in the last 30 years. Medicaid spending over the last 30 years was \$443 billion. Over the next 7, we will spend almost double that amount, \$785 billion. I renew my challenge to the other side: Tell the American people how that is a cut.

Mr. Speaker, in April the six Medicare trustees, concluded that Medicare is going broke. The trustees included three Members of the President's Cabinet: Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services; Robert Rubin, Secretary of Treasury; and Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor, and the President's appointed head of Medicare, Bruce Vladek, they all concluded that Medicare is going bankrupt in the year 2002.

Now, what does the Medicare Preservation Act do and what does it not do? Mr. Speaker, the Medicare Preservation Act will not raise Medicare copayments and deductibles, other than an increase in premiums for the very wealthy. It will not reduce services or benefits in the Medicare program. It will not force anyone to join an HMO.

The Medicare Preservation Act will retain the current fee-for-service plan, which means that beneficiaries can retain their choice of health providers and not be forced into an HMO. It will insure the solvency of Medicare, until at least the year 2010. It will increase the average annual spending per beneficiary, from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002. It will require Part B beneficiary premiums to cover 31.5 percent of the program costs, the same that it is doing today. It does ensure that core benefits in the current Medicare program will be retained and must be offered to all beneficiaries, regardless of health status or age.

□ 2340

It will increase the amount to be spent over the next 7 years by \$659 billion over that spent in the last 7 years, and it will attack fraud and abuse in tough new programs that have criminal penalties.

The Medicare Preservation Act will provide new and attractive choices for beneficiaries, provider-sponsored networks, medical savings accounts, but, Mr. Speaker, the plan will provide for significant patient and consumer protections.

Many have raised questions regarding increases in their Medicare Part B premiums. In 1988, Medicare Part B premiums were \$24.80 per month. This year the premium is \$46.10 per month. Premiums have doubled in the last 7 years, and if nothing is done, they will increase to \$87 in the year 2002. But, Mr. Speaker, let me also add that

monthly Social Security benefits for retired workers will increase from \$702 a month today to \$965 a month in the same program in the same period.

Mr. Speaker, a top priority of this bill is combating Medicare fraud and abuse. I am on the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment and we held several hearings on this subject. The General Accounting Office has estimated that we can save possibly 5 or 10 percent in Medicare spending. From now on seniors will have the right to review their Medicare bills and if they discover fraud, they can receive a portion of the savings.

Mr. Speaker, by providing seniors with added choices, while not increasing their share of the percent of the premiums, the Medicare Preservation Act will be good for senior citizens, and for taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FLANAGAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPUBLICANS MEET BUDGET CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, today, November 17, this House passed a balanced budget, the 1995 Balanced Budget Act. Twenty-six years it has taken to reach this day. Mr. Speaker, 26 years of spending, and spending, and taxing, and spending. Today we met the challenge, we stood up for the American people, and we have decided that we are going to bring the fiscal policies of this country into order.

Mr. Speaker, 40 years, though, this House has been controlled by one party, 40 years. What do we hear when we now are trying to do what the American people sent us here to do, and that is to balance the budget? We hear the status quo being preached from the other side; that we are going to ruin this country; that we are going to hurt our senior citizens; that we are going to hurt children; that we are going to do harm to this great country.

Mr. Speaker, why is it after 40 years, why is it after 30 years of the war on poverty and the design for the Great Society that was initiated in 1965, why is it that we have the highest crime rate in the world? Why is it that illit-

eracy is growing and SAT scores are going down? Teenage pregnancy, illegitimacy is growing at an alarming rate. Drugs are out of control. Poverty is going up. Medicare is going bankrupt. Taxes for the average family are 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, 38 percent of our gross domestic product is consumed by the public sector. We are \$5 trillion in debt, and we hear from our colleagues across the aisle that we are going to ruin this country.

Mr. Speaker, I submit tonight that the Great Society that was started in 1965 is a failure. The Great Society that was started in 1965, promised to win the war on poverty. As I said a minute ago, there are more in poverty today than when that started. The Great Society has taken us down the primrose lane to a society that is in trouble today. \$5 trillion. \$5 trillion was spent to win the war on poverty. The tragedy today is that we lost that war, and we are \$5 trillion in debt.

Today, I think we have started down the right road to a new future, to a truly new Great Society, a society that is going to depend on personal responsibility, on community responsibility, on State responsibility. We have started down a road where we are going to lower the taxes on middle-income families. We are going to give back to mothers and fathers and children their own money that they can spend it the way that they see fit. We are going to save Medicare for our senior citizens. We are going to turn the welfare problem around. We are going to reform it.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I was sent here to do, and the reason that I wanted to come here, to try to solve these problems. I have a 13-year-old daughter. I have a 24-year-old son, and they have no future unless we do something. I think we started to do it today.

Mr. Speaker, if I look down through the years, and if we do not solve these problems, my daughter, sometime midway through her work career and through her life, she will be seeing a \$4 trillion deficit for one year of spending for this government in the year 2030. We cannot go down that road. I think we are doing the right thing as we started down the right road today.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2491) "An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996," fails.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment to the bill from the House (H.R. 2491) "An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year

1996," and concur to the above entitled bill with an amendment.

THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I guess I have 12 more minutes, and I am delighted that you are willing to stay and allow me to have this special order with my friend from Kentucky. I would just like to express extraordinary gratitude for the opportunity I have, and my colleagues have, to serve in this House at this historic moment in the history of our country.

For the last 30 years, our national debt has gone up from \$375 billion to over \$4,900 billion, a 13-fold increase. During a good part of that time, I served in the State House and I wondered how Congress could do such a thing to its children. I could not comprehend how they could do it. The White House as well, of both parties.

We have seen this incredible deficit increase, continue every year adding to the national debt 13-fold and this Congress has decided to put an end to it. Today, we passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1996, which gets us on a glide-path to a balanced budget in 7 years.

□ 2350

When we first started out last election, we had a Contract With America and a number of people said that will cause the defeat of moderate Republicans in particular and that it was not a very wise thing to have done politically.

I remember being asked by one of my editorial boards how I could have signed it. I asked this question, what do you think of the Contract With America that the majority party at that time has? And there was deafening silence because they did not have any program in the opening day for reforms.

They did not have 10 major reforms during the first 100 days. They had nothing. I wondered why people would be critical of a contract that did not criticize the President of the United States, did not criticize the Democrats in Congress, but was a positive plan for what we wanted to accomplish.

After we got elected with no incumbent Republican losing, fighting for a very positive program, people said, well, you used it to get elected but you will not implement it.

We started to implement it. And then they said, well, you are not going to be able to, moderates, of which I think I am one, pretty much more in the center, and I think my colleague from Kentucky would probably consider himself more to the right and more conservative, they said, you all will not get along well together.

We get along tremendously, because there is so much common ground that

binds us in wanting to save this country from bankruptcy and to do two other things. We want to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget. We want to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare. And the third thing we want to do is we want to change and transform this care-taking social and corporate welfare state into what I would call a caring opportunity society, a word that we would hear conservatives use more than a moderate. But that is what we want. We want opportunity in this country. So we started to implement this plan and getting along well with each other for a common purpose.

Then they said, well, you will not get along with the Senate. Frankly, we get along quite well with the Senate, as I think my colleague will agree. Then they said, well, you voted for a balanced budget amendment but you would not be so foolish as to try to pass a balanced budget in 7 years and take on all the special interests in the process. And we proceeded to do that.

If someone wants to know the determination we have, I would describe it this way: We left the old world and we traveled by ship to the new world and we got to the new world. We set out to conquer this new world, knowing that we would never go back to the old world. We burned our ships. There is no retreat. We do not want to go back to the old world. We want to save this country from bankruptcy and transform this corporate and welfare state into an opportunity society.

Before yielding to my colleague in just a few seconds here, a few minutes, we proceeded to take on every special interest in the process.

I want to express gratitude to the Washington Post, which in a sense has been watching us for the past nine months and has been critical of certain things we have done. But they had an editorial yesterday entitled, *The Real Default*. And I just will read what they said about what we have attempted to do.

They started, "The budget deficit is the central problem of the Federal Government and one from which many of the country's other, most difficult problems flow. The deficit is largely driven in turn by the cost of the great entitlements that go not to small special classes of rich and poor but across the board to almost all Americans in time."

Then it goes on to say, "Bill Clinton and the congressional Democrats were handed an unusual chance this year to deal constructively with the effect of Medicare on the deficit and they blew it. The chance came in the form of the congressional Republican plan to balance the budget over 7 years."

Then they said, finally, "Some other aspects of the plan deserve to be resisted, but the Republican proposal to get at the deficit partly by confronting the cost of Medicare deserves support."

The Washington Post grades us pretty tough. They have given us an A plus.

I just want to express my gratitude to the people at the Post for recognizing that there has been incredible courage on the part of all Republicans, conservatives and moderates, to save this country from bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely true. We are unified in this effort. We realize that we have this historic opportunity and now is the time. We have a window of opportunity. I believe with all my heart if we do not do it now, that we are not going to have the opportunity. I do not know when we draw the line and say, after this there is no hope. But we are going to reach a time when the debt is going to get out of control. The interest will be out of control. We will not be able to solve the problem.

I would like to ask the gentleman, do you not feel that this is it, this is our chance? This is our opportunity.

Mr. SHAYS. This is truly an historic moment for all of us and an opportunity that I think my colleague from Kentucky would agree has presented itself after a tremendous amount of work. We want to seize this opportunity. When we talk about getting our financial house in order and balancing our budget, we are doing it by still allowing government to grow but in many cases we are slowing the growth of government. In some cases we are eliminating programs, cutting back in others, consolidating departments, eliminating some units within departments. Having real cuts, spending less the next year, eliminating the Department of Commerce as one of our first steps in consolidation.

In other cases, with entitlements, we are allowing them to grow. Medicare and Medicaid will grow significantly. We have had talk about the earned income tax credit and talk on the other side that we were cutting this program, when in fact it is going to go from \$19 billion to \$27 billion, excuse me, \$25 billion, an increase of 28 percent, not a cut. Only in Washington, when you spend so much more, do people call it a cut. The school lunch program is going to go from \$6.3 billion to \$7.8 billion, an increase. The student loan program is going to go from \$24 billion to \$36 billion.

I do not know how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can say it with a straight face and say we are cutting the student loan program when it is going to grow, 6.7 million students, it is going to grow to 8.4 million. Medicaid is going to grow from \$89 billion to \$127 billion. Medicare from \$178 billion to \$289 billion. We are cutting programs. We are slowing the growth of others. But these programs have significant increases. Yet our colleagues call it a cut.

Ultimately in 7 years, we will have slowed the growth of spending so it will intersect with revenue and we will have no more deficits. That is an important element of this. But another

important element of it is, in the process of reducing our government, we are also going to transform it from a welfare state, both on social programs and even on corporate programs.

We are going to transform it into an opportunity society. We are going to teach people how to grow the seeds instead of just giving them the food.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing. We will not ever forsake those who truly need help. We are going to help those. There is always going to be that social safety net for those who cannot help themselves. But we want to be a helping hand up and out of poverty, not keeping them in poverty with the welfare system that holds people down and keeps them dependent upon the government.

We want to free people. We want to allow them to achieve all the God-given gifts that they have to be the best that they can be in this wonderful country that we have. I think to be criticized and to be called mean-spirited and other words that have been applied to us for trying to save this country by balancing the budget is truly wrong. We are doing what we feel and what the American people have asked us to do. It will save this country.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, we are going to get our financial house in order. We are going to save our trust funds in the process. We are going to transform this welfare state into an opportunity society. And in the process, we are going to save America.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the editorial to which I referred.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 16, 1995]

THE REAL DEFAULT

The budget deficit is the central problem of the federal government and one from which many of the country's other, most difficult problems flow. The deficit is largely driven in turn by the cost of the great entitlements that go not to small special classes of rich or poor but across the board to almost all Americans in time. The most important of these are the principal social insurance programs for the elderly, Social Security and Medicare. In fiscal terms, Medicare is currently the greatest threat and chief offender.

Bill Clinton and the congressional Democrats were handed an unusual chance this year to deal constructively with the effect of Medicare on the deficit, and they blew it. The chance came in the form of the congressional Republican plan to balance the budget over seven years. Some other aspects of that plan deserved to be resisted, but the Republican proposal to get at the deficit partly by confronting the cost of Medicare deserved support. The Democrats, led by the president, chose instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors. They have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that's where the votes are and the way to derail the Republican proposals generally. The president was still doing it this week; a Republican proposal to increase Medicare premiums was one of the reasons he alleged for the veto that has shut down the government—and never mind that he himself, in his own budget, would countenance a similar increase.

We've said some of this before; it gets more serious. If the Democrats play the Medicare card and win, they will have set back for years, for the worst of political reasons, the very cause of rational government in behalf of which they profess to be behaving. Politically, they will have helped to lock in place the enormous financial pressure that they themselves are first to deplore on so many other federal programs, not least the programs for the poor. That's the real default that could occur this year. In the end, the Treasury will meet its financial obligations. You can be pretty sure of that. The question is whether the president and the Democrats will meet or flee their obligations of a different kind. On the strength of the record so far, you'd have to bet on flight.

You'll hear the argument from some that this is a phony issue; they contend that the deficit isn't that great a problem. The people who make this argument are whistling past a graveyard that they themselves most likely helped to dig. The national debt in 1980 was less than \$1 trillion. That was the sum of all the deficits the government had previously incurred—the whole two centuries' worth. The debt now, a fun-filled 15 years later, is five times that and rising at a rate approaching \$1 trillion a presidential term. Interest costs are a seventh of the budget, by themselves now a quarter of a trillion dollars a year and rising; we are paying not just for the government we have but for the government we had and didn't pay for earlier.

The blamesters, or some of them, will tell you Ronald Reagan did it, and his low-tax credit-card philosophy of government surely played its part. The Democratic Congresses that ratified his budgets and often went him one better on tax cuts and spending increases played their part as well. Various

sections of the budget are also favorite punching bags, depending who is doing the punching. You will hear it said that someone's taxes ought to be higher (generally someone else's), or that defense should be cut, or welfare, or farm price supports or the cost of the bureaucracy. But even Draconian cuts in any or all of these areas would be insufficient to the problem and, because dwelling on them is a way of pretending the real deficit-generating costs don't exist, beside the point as well.

What you don't hear said in all this talk of which programs should take the hit, since the subject is so much harder politically to confront, is that the principal business of the federal government has become elder-care. Aid to the elderly, principally through Social Security and Medicare, is now a third of all spending and half of all for other than interest on the debt and defense. That aid is one of the major social accomplishments of the past 30 years; the poverty rate for elderly is now, famously, well below the rate for the society as a whole. It is also an enormous and perhaps unsustainable cost that can only become more so as the baby-boomers shortly begin to retire. how does the society deal with it?

The Republicans stepped up to this as part of their proposal to balance the budget. About a fourth of their spending cuts would come from Medicare. It took guts to propose that. You may remember the time, not that many months ago, when the village wisdom was that, whatever else they proposed, they'd never take on Medicare this way. There were too many votes at stake. We don't mean to suggest by this that their proposal with regard to Medicare is perfect—it most emphatically is not, as we ourselves have said as much at some length in this

space. So they ought to be argued with, and ways should be found to take the good of their ideas while rejecting the bad.

But that's not what the President and congressional Democrats have done. They've trashed the whole proposal as destructive, taken to the air waves with a slick scare program about it, championing themselves as noble defenders of those about to be victimized. They—the Republicans—want to take away your Medicare; that's the insistent PR message the Democrats have been drumming into the elderly and the children of the elderly all year. The Democrats used to complain that the Republicans used wedge issues; this is the super wedge. And it's wrong. In the long run, if it succeeds, the tactic will make it harder to achieve not just the right fiscal result but the right social result. The lesson to future politicians will be that you reach out to restructure Medicare at your peril. The result will be to crowd out of the budget other programs for less popular or powerful constituencies—we have in mind the poor—that the Democrats claim they are committed to protect.

There's ways to get the deficit down without doing enormous social harm. It isn't rocket science. You spread the burden as widely as possible. Among much else, that means including the broad and, in some respects, inflated middle-class entitlements in the cuts. That's the direction in which the President ought to be leading and the congressional Democrats following. To do otherwise is to hide, to lull the public and to perpetuate the budget problem they profess to be trying to solve. Let us say it again: If that's what happens, it will be the real default.